

H.T.DICKINSON,

" HENRY ST.JOHN AND THE STRUGGLE FOR THE LEADERSHIP
OF THE TORY PARTY,1702-14."

A Thesis presented for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

September,1967.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	page iv
Abbreviations	vi
A note on dates	xi
Introduction : The Political Context	1
<u>Part One : Henry St.John and the Tory</u>	
<u>party,1702-1714.</u>	
1. The Principles and Prejudices of the Tory party	28
2. The Membership and Composition of the Tory party	92
3. The Organisation of the Tory party	122
4. St.John and the Tory leaders	147
Appendix 1 : Active Tory peers	193
Appendix 11 : Active Tory M.Ps.	198
<u>Part Two : Henry St.John and the Leadership</u>	
<u>of the Tories,1702-1714.</u>	
5. Henry St.John : A Leader in the Making	221
6. Secretary at War : The Convert to Moderation	298
7. Retirement and Realignment	361
8. The Emerging Rival to Harley	434
Appendix 111 : The October Club	493

9. Secretary of State and the Making of the Peace	502
10. Bolingbroke's bid for the Leadership	562
Conclusion	627
Bibliography	644

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In pursuing my research for this thesis I have been fortunate in meeting with many acts of kindness and much helpful advice. It would be impossible to record here my appreciation of every librarian and archivist, who has assisted me in tracing books and manuscript collections. In addition to those in charge of the numerous archives and repositories, which are listed in the bibliography, many others went to a great deal of trouble to answer my queries. I thank them all. I would particularly like to thank the following private owners, who have allowed me to consult their papers even when it meant intruding into their homes : the duke of Buccleugh, the duke of Devonshire, the duke of Marlborough, the duke of Portland, the marquess of Bath, Lord Downshire, Lord Spencer, Sir Reginald Ernle-Erle-Plunkett-Drax, Sir John Carew-Pole, Sir Harry Verney, Mrs. O. R. Bagot, and the owners of the Studley Royal estate.

Several scholars have given me valuable advice at various times and I would like to thank Professor J. R. Jones at the University of East Anglia, Dr. E. L. Ellis at Aberystwyth, Dr. B. W. Hill at East Anglia, and Mr. G. S. Holmes at Glasgow University. Mr. Holmes was particularly helpful and he allowed me to use his microfilms of the Hanover Mss., of some of the Brydges letters,

and of Robert Walcott's record cards of M.Ps. Unfortunately Mr. Holmes's major work, British Politics in the Age of Anne, appeared too late to be used in writing this thesis. No researcher could have had a more helpful supervisor than I have had in Dr. W.A. Speck. I hope I have benefitted from his great knowledge of this period and from his own rigorous and analytical approach to historical research.

This research could not have been undertaken without the award of the Earl Grey Fellowship for 1964-66 by the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. This allowed me to study in a most agreeable department. Finally, I would like to acknowledge my rare good fortune in having been able to study history for nine years under the late Professor W.L. Burn. It would be impossible to record all the occasions when I have benefitted from his professional advice and example, and from many acts of kindness. Suffice it to say that without him this thesis would never have been written.

It only remains to state that this thesis is the product of independent research. It has not been submitted for any other degree at any university. The conclusions are my own and are based on my own research.

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations have been used extensively in the text, though, on their first appearance in the footnotes, the book titles have been given in full.

B.M.	British Museum
Add.Ms.	Additional manuscript
P.R.O.	Public Record Office
H.M.C.	Historical Manuscripts Commission
<u>E.H.R.</u>	<u>English Historical Review</u>
<u>Bull.Inst.Hist.Res.</u>	<u>Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research</u>
<u>Bolingbroke's Corr.</u>	<u>Letters and Correspondence of the Right Honourable Henry St. John, Lord Visc. Bolingbroke, ed. Gilbert Parke. 4 vols. (London, 1798).</u>
<u>Boyer's Annals</u>	<u>Abel Boyer, The History of the Reign of Queen Anne digested into Annals. 11 vols. (London, 1703-13).</u>
<u>Boyer's Political State</u>	<u>Abel Boyer, Quadriennium Annae Postrerum ; or the Political State of Great Britain. 8 vols. (2nd ed.; London, 1718-19).</u>

Burnet

Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time. 6 vols. (2nd ed.; Oxford, 1833).

Churchill

W.S.Churchill, Marlborough : His Life and Times. 4 vols. (London, 1934-38).

Collection of the Addresses

A Collection of the Addresses which have been presented to the Queen since the Impeachment of the Reverend Dr. Henry Sacheverell. 2 vols. (London, 1711).

Commons' Debates

Richard Chandler, The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons. Vols. iii-v. (London, 1742).

Commons' Journals

The Journals of the House of Commons. Vols. xiii-xvii.

Coxe

William Coxe, Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough. 6 vols. (2nd. ed.; London, 1820).

Feiling

Keith Feiling, A History of the Tory Party 1640-1714. (Oxford, 1924).

Hanover Mss

Kreienberg's dispatches to Hanover, 1710-14. Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv, Hanover, Germany. Calenberg

Briefe Archiv. 24 England, 99,
107a, and 113a.

Hearne

Remarks and Collections of
Thomas Hearne, ed. C.E. Doble and
D.W. Rannie. 4 vols. (Oxford, 1885-
98).

Heinsius Mss

L'Hermitage's dispatches to
Heinsius, 1702-14. Algemeen Rijks-
archief, The Hague, Holland.

Journal to Stella

Jonathan Swift, Journal to Stella,
ed. Harold Williams. 2 vols. (Oxford,
1948).

Lords' Debates

Ebenezer Timberland, The History
and Proceedings of the House of
Lords. Vols. ii-iii. (London, 1742).

Lords' Journals

The Journals of the House of
Lords. Vols. xvii-xx.

Luttrell

Narcissus Luttrell, Brief Historical
Relation of State Affairs. Vols. v-
vi. (Oxford, 1857).

Parliamentary History

William Cobbett's Parliamentary
History of England. Vols. vi-vii.
(London, 1810).

Plumb's Political Stability

J.H.Plumb,The Growth of Political Stability in England 1675-1725. (London,1967).

Prussian Mss

Dispatches to Berlin from Bonet and Spanheim,1702-15.Deutsches Zentralarchiv,Merseburg,East Germany.Rep.XI,England,Nummer 25B-39A.

Somers Tracts

A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts...of the late Lord Somers,ed.Walter Scott. Vols.xii-xiii.(2nd ed.;London, 1814).

Swift's Corr.

The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift,ed.F.Eltrington Ball.Vols. i-ii.(London,1910).

Swift's Prose Works

The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift,ed.Herbert Davis and others. 13 vols.(Oxford,1939-64).

Vernon Corr.,ed.James

Letters Illustrative of the Reign of William III from 1696 to 1708 addressed to the Duke of

Shrewsbury by James Vernon, ed. G.
P.R.James. 3 vols. (London, 1841).

Wentworth Papers

The Wentworth Papers 1705-1739, ed.
James J. Cartwright. (London, 1883).

Wodrow's Analecta

Rev. Robert Wodrow, Analecta ; or
Materials for a History of
Remarkable Providences. Vols. i-ii.
(Maitland Club, 1842).

A Note on Dates

In Anne's reign Britain's calendar was eleven days behind that used in most European countries. In this work all dates referring to events in Britain are given in the Old Style (O.S.), though the new year is taken as beginning on 1 January. The dates of events in Europe are given in the New Style (N.S.) or in both styles, e.g. 14/25 May 1709.

Introduction: The Political Context.

This dissertation is not intended simply as a study of Henry St. John's early political career, though indirectly this will be an important aspect of it. Rather it is meant to be a study of St. John's relations with the Tory party, with its leaders, its rank and file, and its political philosophy, in the age of Anne. At first it was planned as a narrative account. In many ways part two of this work fulfils my original objectives. However, during the course of my research, it became increasingly obvious that some attempt had to be made to analyse and define the Tory party. Without this preliminary work it would be impossible to understand the aims and problems of the Tory party and its leaders. Even a cursory study of Anne's reign reveals a much-divided Tory party, a party without a coherent philosophy and with leaders frequently pulling in different directions. Thus, part one of this dissertation attempts to make the divisions within the Tory party intelligible by analysing its principles, its composition, its organisation, and its leadership. Though this has considerably lengthened this work I feel that it was a task which could not be shirked. Even this was not sufficient, however, for the Tory party did not work in a vacuum or in the political context so familiar to us today. The following few pages therefore attempt to fit the Tory party into the political background or structure of Anne's reign, by

examining, in particular, the nature of the party struggle and the rôle of the parties and the Court in the political life of the nation.

Sir Lewis Namier has taught us all to eschew the facile labelling of large bodies of politicians and members of parliament with the names of 'Whig' and 'Tory'. His massive researches on the early years of George III's reign, and, in particular, his analytical technique have made all historians of 'parties' look at their material with a new awareness. His work has illuminated the complexities of political parties far removed from the England of George III. It was perhaps inevitable that some historian would apply Namier's methods to the politics of Anne's reign. This task was undertaken by Professor Robert Walcott, who put forward the thesis that in the reigns of William III and Queen Anne there were no parties based on recognisable political principles, but rather a 'government' interest and seven 'connections' based on personal and family relationships. Since he was unable to include all members of parliament under these categories, he divided the rest loosely into 'court' or 'country' members. These were men who were naturally predisposed to trust or oppose the government of the day. Walcott thus rejected the idea of a two-party system operating at this period and asserted that the political structure resembled in many respects the mid-Hanoverian period so ably analysed by Namier. This thesis

was first put forward in an article published in 1941.¹ Fifteen years later a much expanded version of this appeared as a monograph.² More recently Walcott has defended his views. Though to some extent retreating from his former exposed position by admitting that the two-party interpretation held good on a few issues like that of the 'Church in Danger' and that of the protestant succession, he continued to maintain that in day to day affairs the two-party system was not apparent.³

Walcott's thesis, backed by some impressive statistical and analytical data, has been accepted by some historians. Both Dorothy Marshall and A. S. Foord, though dealing principally with the period after 1714, have shown their acceptance of the Walcott interpretation.⁴ Of the historians dealing with the later Stuart period only Sir George Clark appears to have accepted Walcott's conclusions.⁵ Yet, in fairness, it must be admitted that some contemporary observers of the political scene in Anne's reign could detect no real differences between the parties on questions of principle, and believed the

1 Robert Walcott, 'English Party Politics 1688-1714', in Essays in Modern English History presented to W. C. Abbott (Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., 1941), pp. 81-131.

2 Robert Walcott, English Politics in the Early Eighteenth Century (Oxford, 1956).

3 Robert Walcott, 'The Idea of Party in the Writing of Later Stuart History', Journal of British Studies (May 1962), 1, no. 2, 54-61.

4 Dorothy Marshall, Eighteenth Century England (London, 1962), pp. 59-62; and A. S. Foord, His Majesty's Opposition 1714-1830 (Oxford, 1964), pp. 20-25. Foord referred to Walcott's 'ground-breaking essay'.

5 Sir George N. Clark, The Later Stuarts, 1660-1714 (2nd. ed.; Oxford, 1955), pp. 222-223, and especially p. 223 n.

divisions were between 'ins' and 'outs'. In April 1710 Sir John Percival wrote to his friend, George Berkeley:

"I look upon the differences between Whig and Tory to proceed only from a desire of the one to keep in & the other to get into Employment. This, their ambition, avarice and personal picque, being but ill inducement for to obtain followers. One party pretends we are in danger of Anarchy or Presbytery, and the other of Tyranny and Popery, all which is only to beguile the multitude and support their interests the mighty feuds do therefore rise in my opinion from desire of places, which begetts personal hatred, and that slander and defamation after which follows jealousy, distaste and fears."⁶

A few months later Francis Hare, one of the most prolific political pamphleteers of the age, took a similar line in a letter to the duchess of Marlborough:

"Whig and Tory were names of distinction before the Revolution, and I think now subsist independent of it; and whatever these names may once have meant, the last reign shewed pretty plainly that nothing but being in or out of court is at the bottom of them, for in that reign both sides, as occasion served, took leave of their pretended principles, and the Whigs acted to the height of the Tory part, and the Tories that of the Whigs, and from thence I can't but conclude, that both sides mean themselves in the first place, whatever they pretend."⁷

After the 1713 general election, Peter Wentworth, a close observer of the political scene, wrote to his brother, Lord Strafford: "I'll send you a list of all the Parliament men, but it will be hard to say who

⁶ B.M.Add.Ms. 47026, ff. 23-24. Letter dated London, 20 April 1710.

⁷ Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough (London, 1838), i, 402. Letter dated St. Andre, 30 Oct. 1710.

is Whig and who is Tories, people change so often."⁸ Moreover it must be admitted that there are instances when politicians seem to betray all their apparent principles. Thus we find the high Tory, St. John, being won over by the moderates with the offer of the secretaryship at war; the earl of Nottingham deserting the Tories in December 1711; and the Whigs abandoning the cause of the Dissenters over the Occasional Conformity bill of the same date.

Nonetheless no recent work on Anne's reign has accepted Walcott's thesis. J. P. Kenyon and Michael Foot have rejected this interpretation explicitly and Christopher Hill did so implicitly.⁹ More detailed criticisms have been made by several scholars completing theses on the period.¹⁰ Some of this criticism has begun

⁸ The Wentworth Papers, ed. J. J. Cartwright (London, 1883), hereafter cited as Wentworth Papers, p. 354. Letter dated Windsor, 13 Sept. 1713.

⁹ J. P. Kenyon, The Stuarts (Fontana ed.; London, 1966), p. 211; Michael Foot, The Pen and the Sword (London, 1957), pp. 372-376; and Christopher Hill, The Century of Revolution (London, 1962), especially p. 284.

¹⁰ B. W. Hill, 'The Career of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, 1702-1714', unpublished Cambridge Ph.D. thesis (1961); E. L. Ellis, 'The Whig Junto in relation to the development of party politics and party organization, from its inception to 1714', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1962); H. G. Horwitz, 'Daniel Finch, Earl of Nottingham', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1963); A.J.D.M. McInnes, 'Robert Harley, Secretary of State', unpublished University of Wales M.A. thesis (1961); P. M. Scholes, 'Parliament and the Protestant Dissenters 1702-1719', unpublished London M.A. thesis (1962); and W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-1714: A Study in Political Organization', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1965).

to appear in print, and more is likely to follow.¹¹ The effect of this work is to some extent reflected in the work of J. H. Plumb. In the first volume of his biography of Walpole he wrote: "Although I am in substantial agreement with Professor Walcott, I think that he allows too little significance to conceptions of party, particularly amongst the Whigs."¹² When he came to review Walcott's book he was somewhat more critical and concluded that there were great political issues in Anne's reign, about which men could feel very deeply: "Although it is helpful to stress the similarities between the politics of the early years of Queen Anne's reign and those of 1760, and for this all historians will be in Professor Walcott's debt, the

11 Three articles have appeared which reject Walcott's views on party politics: J. G. Sperling, 'The Division of 25 May 1711, on an amendment to the South Sea Bill: A note on the reality of parties in the age of Anne', Historical Journal (1961), iv, no. 2, 191-202; W. A. Speck, 'The Choice of a Speaker in 1705', Bulle[tin of the Inst[itute of] Hist[orical] Res[earch] (1964), xxxvii, 20-46; and Henry Horwitz, 'Parties, Connections, and Parliamentary Politics, 1689-1714: Review and Revision', Journal of British Studies (Nov. 1966), vi, 1, 45-69. A fourth article also indirectly attacking the Walcott view is G. S. Holmes, 'The Commons' Division on 'No Peace without Spain', 7 December 1711', Bull.Inst.Hist.Res. (1960), xxxiii, 223-234. Mr. Holmes is also to publish a major work on British Politics in the Age of Anne, which should be a major reply to Walcott. Two of my own articles are to be published shortly; 'The Poor Palatines and the Parties', in E.H.R. (July 1967) and 'The Tory Party's attitude to foreigners: a note on party principles in the age of Anne', in Bull.Inst.Hist.Res. (Nov. 1967).

12 J. H. Plumb, Sir Robert Walpole (London, 1956), 1, 65 n.

differences are more remarkable and more important."¹³ In a recently published book Professor Plumb has reached a harsher, though justified, conclusion:

"His [Walcott's] book has been widely used and widely quoted, with the result that confusion now prevails. Although there is much in Walcott's book of value, at least for the expert scholar, it is basically very unsound. Walcott all too frequently mistook genealogy for political history, and creates factions out of family relationships without even considering the political actions, ideas, or attitudes of the men in question; his case histories are badly chosen, and at times untypical. His failure to consider his analysis in the total structure of politics is little less than disastrous."¹⁴

Walcott's thesis rests very heavily on his seven 'connections', but unfortunately these do not stand up to close examination. J. H. Plumb could not accept the Newcastle-Pelham-Townshend-Walpole faction, "for which there is no evidence that its members ever consulted together or deliberately and consciously acted in union." He showed that Sir John Holland was no man's client, that Horatio Walpole was in fact an avowed Tory, and that both Lord Hartington and Sir Thomas Littleton owed their seats not to Robert Walpole but to Lady Diane Howard.¹⁵ In his study, E. L. Ellis decided that the "Junto's history shows up the inadequacy of Walcott's

¹³ E.H.R. (1957), lxxi, 129.

¹⁴ J. H. Plumb, The Growth of Political Stability in England 1675-1725 (London, 1967), hereafter cited as Plumb's Political Stability, pp. xiv-xv.

¹⁵ Review of Walcott's book, E.H.R. (1957), lxxi, 127-128.

analysis"¹⁶ and H. G. Horwitz believed that Walcott had overrated the size and coherence of the Nottingham-Finch connection.¹⁷ By ignoring principle as a political 'cement' Walcott had to rely too heavily on family ties. Thus Robert Walpole's connection with Newcastle has to depend upon his friendship with the son-in-law of Newcastle's brother-in-law. Sir Roger Mostyn was linked with Nottingham on the basis of 'prospective' son-in-law, while Sir Thomas Hanmer was a cousin of that future son-in-law. Sir John Pakington apparently followed the lead of the earl of Rochester because he had married that peer's second cousin, though she had died in 1696 and he had since remarried.¹⁸ These family links look very thin and they break immediately when the political behaviour of members of some of these groups are examined. St. John is listed in the Harley-Foley group yet an elementary knowledge of the reign of Anne shows that he did not always vote with this group. James Brydges and Thomas Coke are both included in this group yet they remained in office after 1708, when the Harleyites resigned, and they both voted Whig in 1710. When Nottingham voted against the peace in December 1711 very few of his

16 'The Whig Junto in relation to the development of party politics and party organization, from its inception to 1714', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1962), pp. vi-vii, and 10-56.

17 'Daniel Finch, Earl of Nottingham', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1963), pp. vi-viii.

18 W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-1714: A Study in Political Organization', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1965), pp. 19-25.

'nominees' followed his lead.¹⁹ Furthermore if, as Walcott suggested, political groups were only interested in power then they were singularly unsuccessful. It is significant that leaders of large connections like Nottingham, Rochester, and the Whig Junto, only held office for very short periods, whereas Marlborough and Godolphin, with only a small group of followers, held office for much of the reign.

If Walcott's interpretation is to stand up, then an analysis of the extant voting lists for the reign of Anne should show a high degree of cross-voting. If the motivation was 'place' rather than 'principle' then members should vote 'Whig' on some occasions and 'Tory' on others. Yet just the opposite was the case. The average M.P. voted consistently along party lines even on lesser issues. There are nine voting lists and three compilations which describe the political behaviour of M.P.s during Anne's reign on the basis of party.²⁰ These give information on about 1,100 of the approximately 1,250 M.P.s of the reign. Of these members 500 habitually voted Tory and nearly 450 constantly divided on the Whig side.²¹ The career of Sir Charles Turner can only be described in terms of party; he voted Whig in 1703, 1705, 1706, 1709, 1710, 1711 (twice), 1713, and 1714, and never appeared

19 G. S. Holmes, 'The Commons' Division on 'No Peace without Spain', 7 December 1711', Bull.Inst.Hist.Res. (1960), xciii, 227.

20 One list, giving the voting on a clause in the Regency bill of 1706, gave Court supporters rather than Whigs or Tories as such and was not used by W. A. Speck. For the various lists and compilations see chapter two, below, pp.94-96.

21 W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-1714: A Study in Political Organization', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1965), chapter two.

on a Tory list. Many others, on both sides, were just as consistent. The 150 or so members, who registered votes on both sides, were Hanoverian Tories or Court supporters. For example the Court managed to persuade 25 Tories to vote for a Whig Speaker in 1705, but no fewer than 19 of these were placemen.²² And, in 1713, over seventy Tories rebelled.

Walcott had a myopic view of politics, a virtual worm's eye view, which is a limitation of the whole 'structural' approach. Major events of Anne's reign receive scant attention. The war, the union with Scotland, the Sacheverell affair, the protestant succession, are barely mentioned. The only parliamentary session he considered in detail was that of 1705-8, when party distinctions were particularly blurred. Similarly Walcott was very selective in collecting source material. Most of the famous collections of political correspondence are ignored. Even more surprising was the way he passed over the activities of political pamphleteers. Yet Swift, Defoe, Addison, and Steele, to name only the famous, were quite clear about the distinctions between the Whigs and the Tories. Nearly all the politicians and all the foreign agents and envoys spoke in terms of Whig and Tory, and would have been baffled by Walcott's interpretation. For instance, Marshal Tallard, who was in captivity in Nottingham, claimed that the whole country was divided between the

²² W. A. Speck, 'The Choice of a Speaker in 1705', Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. (1964), xxxvii, 32 and note.

Whigs and the Tories, with not a single village unscathed by the party war.²³

Tallard was right; party politics were evident at grass-roots level. More elections took place between 1689 and 1715 than in all the rest of the eighteenth century. Not only were there more general elections, there were more contests at constituency level. In 1761 only three counties were contested, whereas in 1705 at least 24 counties went to the polls and in 1710 at least 20 counties did so. There were only about fifty proprietary boroughs in Anne's reign and about one third of the boroughs remained relatively open to candidates of either party in every election.²⁴ Major issues dominated each general election of the reign, for example, the 'Church in danger' in 1705 and 1710, the commercial treaty with France in 1713. The two media of mass communication, the pulpit and the press, were both persuasive and widely used in elections. Sacheverell's sermon sold 40,000 copies, and by 1712 there were 67,000 newspapers sold each week. The numerous addresses presented to the Queen in 1710 show that the electorate were not ignorant of major political issues. Party propaganda could successfully change the political complexion of

23 P.R.O. Baschet transcripts. 31/3/192, f. 193. To Torcy, Nottingham, 31 July 1705.

24 G. S. Holmes, 'The Influence of the Peerage in English Parliamentary Elections, 1702-1713', Oxford B.Litt. thesis (1951), pp. 39 and 161-162.

many constituencies.²⁵ Candidates had to declare their political principles to the electorate. Thus in 1710 George Granville issued a manifesto to the gentlemen of Cornwall, prior to the general election:

"If it shall be judged proper for the service of the County to recommend me for one of their representatives, I think myself obliged before hand to make this solemn protestation that I may be accepted or rejected according as my principles are approved, wch are to support monarchy & the Church for which so many of our ancestors have sacrificed their lives and fortunes together to establish the protestant succession beyond any possibility of dispute.

To restore the credit of the nation, which her Maj[es]tie has so happily retrieved by the late exercise of her royal authority.

To carry on the war against France with such vigour & such intentions, as may produce a safe, honourable, and speedy peace."

It was only after these declarations that Granville added:

"And lastly to serve the County of Cornwall in particular in every respect, that can any way regard its advantage with the utmost power and interest, that I can any way collect. I desire only to be tried in these principalls, I having nothing to value myself upon, but having my veins so full of Cornish blood, as to have the honour of being related perhaps to every one of the Gent[lemen]."²⁶

25 For the rôle of party politics in elections see, W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-1714: A Study in Political Organization', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1965), chapter six; Mary Ransome, 'The General Election of 1710', unpublished London M.A. thesis (1939), chapters 1-2; Elizabeth Cunningham, 'The General Election of 1705', unpublished London M.A. thesis (1939), chapters 2 and 6.

26 Cornwall Record Office. Buller collection. BO/23/63. Letter dated London, 29 Sept. 1710.

Thus Granville put political principles before his strong local interest and connections.²⁷ Indeed even in purely local affairs party divisions were evident. Describing the election of an alderman in Norwich, Humphrey Prideaux wrote: "Mr. Dunch being a sturdy Whig and a fellow of notable parts and understanding, the Mayor, who is a sturdy Tory, resolved to doe all he could to keep him out; and therefore, although the elections in such cases used to be made within 10 or 12 days, the Mayor deferred it till ye middle of ye last month, hoping in all this time to make sure of a party to keep Dunch out."²⁸ The appointment of a clergyman even to a small living raised political issues. Henry Liddell, a staunch Whig, wished to support parson Cowper for a living at Long Horsley, but the duke of Somerset wanted it for a parson Fenwick. Liddell wrote to his friend William Cotesworth to inquire about Fenwick's principles: "How does he vote in ye county elections. Is he very high in principle? You may depend no name shall be made use of. However a few particulars of his conduct seems necessary."²⁹ Partisan feelings even appear to have extended to schoolboys. Ann Clavering, sister-in-law of Lord Chancellor Cowper,

27 Godfrey Davies, 'The Election at Hereford 1702', Huntington Library Quarterly (1948-49), xii, no. 3, 322-327, argued that the election was largely determined by local interests and friendships, but I cannot accept this as typical of the period.

28 The Letters of Humphrey Prideaux to John Ellis, 1674-1722, ed. E. M. Thompson (Camden Society, 1875), p. 196. Letter dated Norwich, 9 May 1705.

29 Newcastle University Library. Misc. Ms. 30, letter 12. Letter dated [London], 10 Oct. 1715.

wrote to James Clavering about their young charge Jacky Clavering, who was then at Eton:

"Att Eaton the school is devided W[hig] and T[ory]. Jacky was one day ingaged fighting a Tory boy and Lady Oglethorp came and bid him give over. Jacky pursued his quarrel so she call'd him names, and told him she'd box him if he gave not over. [She] came up, but mist her blow. This, you may believe, fired Johny, who turn'd and gave her a severe blow on the face and bid her a Popish hussy, put her child in the warming pan and carry it [to] the Queen and make the nation believe 'twas hers."³⁰

Although Walcott's main thesis has been refuted his work has forced historians to look at politics in Anne's reign afresh and in some ways to readjust their views. Walcott has shown that the elections and the composition of the political nation at this time were very similar to those described by Namier. In most counties the preponderant interest was that of the big landowning families; the Russells in Bedford, the Berties in Lincolnshire, the Musgraves in Westmorland. In every election during Anne's reign there were generally about 100 members who owed their seats to aristocratic influence.³¹ More than half the Commons after any election was comprised of landed gentlemen. The big ports, however, like London, Bristol, and Liverpool, were generally represented by important merchants

³⁰ Durham University Library. Clavering Letters. Letter dated London, 21 Dec. 1710. I have edited these letters for the Surtees Society and they will appear as one of the volumes in 1967 under the title, The Correspondence of James Clavering.

³¹ G. S. Holmes, 'The Influence of the Peerage in English Parliamentary Elections, 1702-1713', unpublished Oxford B.Litt. thesis (1951), pp. 156-158.

or manufacturers. Even smaller boroughs might be represented by a local trader, such as Sir Isaac Rebow at Colchester, John Snell at Exeter, and Samuel Swift at Worcester. The more important professions were also well-represented in the Commons. In the parliament of 1701 there were sixty-two lawyers, thirty-nine army, and nine naval officers.³² The electorate was restricted; only 84 constituencies had over 500 voters, while the majority of borough seats had less than 200 voters. Yet every candidate would not only declare his politics, but, even if faced with little or no opposition, would carefully cultivate his constituency. Voters expected to be canvassed and usually some inducement was held out to them to get them to poll. They might be offered incentives like free transport³³ to and entertainment³⁴ at the place of voting. They might even be

32 Robert Walcott, English Politics in the Early Eighteenth Century, pp. 24-33.

33 "As for the freemen about you I hope you will prevail with them to give single votes for me, and you will order somebody to take care to carry them to Carlisle, and what the charge is I shall thankfully repay." Christopher Musgrave to James Grahme, no date, but 1708. Levens Hall Mss. (Bagot papers), box C.

34 "Though you might have desired your Friends sooner, to have been industrious in promoting your interest in the country, yet I assure you there has been nothing wanting hereabouts, upon that account. For my son Coventry sent meat, and I sent a Rump of Beef & a Quarter of Mutton to Broadway, by Hastings Hyde ... Ned Goodere had Brewed 10 Bushels of malt, & Sir H. Parker was also there, having sent meat, so that I suppose your Interest is secured thereabouts. They all drank your Health heartily, & cried out 'a Pakington, a Pakington!' nemine contradicante." Sir William Kent to Sir John Pakington, Ebrington, 28 Mar. 1702. Hampton papers (at Old Rectory, Holt, Worcester, but since moved to Worcester Record Office).

threatened with eviction or with violence.³⁵ A favourable returning officer could manipulate the election in favour of a particular candidate. He might accept unqualified votes³⁶ and reject those of qualified voters³⁷; he could change the date or the place of the election.³⁸ After the elections there were usually numerous petitions against the result; the cases of *Ashby v. White* and the *Bewdley Charter* were the two most celebrated examples.³⁹

-
- 35 For the violence at Coventry see M. D. Harris, 'Memoirs of the Right Hon. Edward Hopkins, M.P. for Coventry', E.H.R. (1919), xxiv, 502. The violence, of course, could be precipitated by sharp differences in political principles. See, for example, the account of the Whig-Tory conflict in the London elections in 1710, in, London in 1710 from the travels of Zacharias Conrad von Uffenbach, ed. W. H. Quarrell and Margaret More (London, 1934), pp. 146-148.
- 36 During the Portsmouth election of 1702 Sir William Gifford told Sir Justinian Isham: "We expect to meet with unfair opposition from their having got 38 new Burgesses made by an unqualified Mayor." Northants Record Office. Isham Correspondence. Bundle 14, no. 2782. Letter dated Dover Street, 30 Oct. 1702.
- 37 Gloucester Record Office. Ducie Morton Mss. D. 340 a. C. 22/1. Letter to Col. Matthew Ducie Morton from freeholders complaining that sheriff had not allowed some genuine votes. Dated Bristol, 12 Oct. 1713.
- 38 "As yet I hear nothing of the writ of Election but do by short adjournments keep the County Court in my power on purpose to gratify you with the time of the Election before the day I shall be obliged to give notice of the day of Election by proclamation and therefore by the favour of a line to tell me when it may best suit with you to have it." Jo. Hall to James Grahme, Temple Sowerby, 30 April 1708. Levens Hall Mss. Box B, file H.
- 39 For the rôle of interest in elections see, Robert Walcott, English Politics in the Early Eighteenth Century, pp. 8-23; J. H. Plumb, Sir Robert Walpole, 1, 37-78; Mary Ransome, 'The General Election of 1710', unpublished London M.A. thesis (1939), chapter four; and especially W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-1714: A Study in Political Organization', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1965), chapter four.

Nevertheless, while accepting the rôle of interest in elections, it should be stressed that this did not exclude the presence of party politics. After all, the electoral situation was fundamentally the same in the 1640s, but this did not prevent men dying for their beliefs. In Anne's reign electoral interests were used to the advantage of a particular party. Great electoral managers, like Beaufort and Wharton, placed their influence at the disposal of their party. Indeed electoral managers acted somewhat as party agents in the constituencies. If the behaviour of their nominees in the Commons did not live up to expectation then patrons would withdraw their support. Thomas Dullane gave an example of this: "Sir W. Lowther has been with me & tells me yt he overtook Sir J[ohn] Key [Kaye] as he went home and told him yt if he voted as he was inform'd he did last sessions yt he must expect none of his interest if he stood againe."⁴⁰ When the Commons judged election petitions they did so on party grounds. Both parties tested their strength after a general election in selecting a chairman of elections. In 1705 the Whigs were able to elect a favourable chairman whose influence over election petitions was expected to increase the Whig majority in the Commons.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Leeds City Library. Temple Newsam Mss. Box 9. To Lord Irwin, Bolton, 20 Aug. 1701.

⁴¹ B.M.Add.Ms. 17677, AAA, f. 510. L'Hermitage's despatch to The Hague, London, 20 Nov. 1705.

Professor Walcott has shown the need for a more systematic approach to politics in Anne's reign and he has discredited the simple two-party interpretation. Before Walcott many historians wrote of politics in Anne's reign as if the Whig and Tory parties were virtually synonymous with the two-party structure of their own day.⁴² They made little attempt to define these parties and, even where they did so, this was not based on any systematic analysis.⁴³ This is even true of Keith Feiling, whose work was essentially narrative, though he did provide a subtle and intelligent account of the divisions within the Tory party during the seventeenth century.⁴⁴ E. L. Ellis⁴⁵ has analysed the Whig party, and part one of this thesis is an attempt to do the same for the Tory party. Professor Walcott was also correct in stressing the importance of the 'Court'-'Country' dichotomy, which could cut across party divisions. He tended, however, to substitute it

⁴² W. F. Lord, 'The development of political parties in the reign of Queen Anne', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (1900), new series, xiv, 69-121; W. T. Morgan, English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne (Yale, 1920); and G. M. Trevelyan, England under Queen Anne (London, 1930-34), 3 vols.

⁴³ W. T. Morgan, 'What was a Tory?' and W. C. Abbott, 'What was a Whig?', Annual Report of the American Historical Association (1942), iii, 269-286 and 253-267, respectively.

⁴⁴ K. Feiling, A History of the Tory Party, 1640-1714 (Oxford, 1924), hereafter cited as Feiling.

⁴⁵ E. L. Ellis, 'The Whig Junto in relation to the development of party politics and party organization, from its inception to 1714', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1962).

for a Whig-Tory interpretation and it is necessary to show that it existed side by side with the two parties. In William III's reign the Court-country division heavily overlaid the party system, but in Anne's reign the parties were more conspicuous.

It is important to realise that the Queen, whatever her personal failings, was at the centre of politics. Only those meetings of ministers that were held in her presence counted as official cabinet meetings, while those gatherings of the ministers without the royal presence were designated as meetings of the lords of the committee. As these committees were responsible to the official cabinet, the Queen was informed of all major decisions and could, if she wished, play a major rôle in these cabinet meetings.⁴⁶ Queen Anne was in fact the last British monarch to exercise the royal veto. The Queen, of course, had immense powers of patronage, especially with her control of so many appointments. In the Commons she could use her influence on those who held office under or received pensions from the crown. These placemen were sometimes referred to as 'Queen's servants'. A black list of 1705 identified 126 of them in the 1702-5 parliament.⁴⁷ Some of these were cabinet ministers, who would change

⁴⁶ J. H. Plumb, 'The Organization of the Cabinet in the reign of Queen Anne', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th Series, (1957), vii, 137-157.

⁴⁷ A List of Gentlemen that are in Offices, Employments, etc. (Cambridge, 1705).

according to the balance of the parties in the Commons. Others, like William Lowndes, secretary to the treasury, Josiah Burchett, secretary to the admiralty, and James Brydges, paymaster-general, were more like professional civil servants, who tried to hold on to their posts no matter which party dominated the cabinet. Many, however, held places or pensions which they did not accept as binding them to support the Court in all circumstances. In the election of the Speaker in 1705 no fewer than 17 placemen voted against the Court.⁴⁸ In 1706 Godolphin considered that there were about 100 'Queen's servants', but believed fifteen of these could not be relied upon.⁴⁹ Robethon told the Hanoverian family that the Court could only count upon fifty to sixty placemen on every occasion,⁵⁰ and this was probably an accurate estimate. Nevertheless the placemen formed a valuable nucleus of support, and many more members of parliament would generally support the Court either in the hopes of reward or as an expression of loyalty to the Crown. Members like these recognised that the Queen had considerable electoral influence throughout the country. She could appoint members as lords lieutenant, sheriffs, J.P.s, etc., in every county as well as to specialist posts like

⁴⁸ W. A. Speck, 'The Choice of a Speaker in 1705', Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. (1964), xxxvii, 24-29.

⁴⁹ H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 291. Godolphin to Harley, 22 Mar. 1706.

⁵⁰ Quoted in 'Aktenstücke zur Thronbesteigung des Welfenhaus in England', ed. Professor R. Pauli, in Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereins für Niedersachsen (Hannover, 1883), p. 5.

chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, warden of the Cinque Ports, and governors of the numerous royal castles. The Queen could control specific seats in dockyard boroughs and in royal navy ports and she could also influence voters through the granting of government contracts.⁵¹ In these several ways the Queen could command a small, but distinct, party; a third force on the political scene.

At all times there were some members who resented the placemen, believing that they represented both waste and corruption by the Court. It was generally the independent and unambitious backbenchers who disliked the way the Court appeared to be undermining the independence of the Commons. Thomas Legh was typical of those members who refused to become subservient to the Court merely for the sake of a place. He explained his position to his brother: "What is it that wee have been falling out about all this while but to keep knaves out of Parliament that would sell their country for their interest. Now after we have soe long blam'd ye doing of this in others, for me to come & doe ye same thing either by my own Vote, or by another's coming in to serve my intrest, it is I think making myself ye worst of mankind, and bread so gott would neither do me nor mine any good."⁵² Members of this persuasion were usually described as

51 W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-1714: A Study in Political Organization', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1965), chapter five; and Robert Walcott, English Politics in the Early Eighteenth Century, pp. 20-22, 36-39, 68-69, 183-200, 216-218.

52 John Rylands Library, Manchester. Legh of Lyme Mss. Box 57. Thomas to Peter Legh, London, 22 Aug. 1704.

belonging to the 'country' party, but, in Anne's reign at least, they mainly combined to support bills to exclude placemen from the Commons.

On these occasions a Whig, like Edward Wortley Montagu, who introduced no fewer than four place bills⁵³, could count upon a measure of Tory support. The place bills could cut across the normal Whig-Tory division. In January 1710 James Lowther wrote of one of these bills: "Those that are against the Bill ... endeavoured to throw out the whole bill and so not to exclude any. But the promoters of it are steady, it being a plain question between court and country in the House of Commons."⁵⁴ This 'country' element was only rarely apparent in Anne's reign, but the Court party always existed. The Court, however, had to operate in a political context, where most men owed allegiance to one of the two political parties.

The Tory party can be regarded as the more conservative and traditional of the two political parties which existed in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, but this does not mean that Tory principles were unchanging or immutable. The period 1688-1714 was a period of constitutional crisis when political principles were subjected to considerable stress. With some men deciding to stand by their principles at all costs and others trimming their sails to the

53 Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montague, ed. Lord Wharncliffe (London, 1861), i, 20-21.

54 Carlisle Record Office. Lonsdale Mss. D/Lons. To William Gilpin.

prevailing wind, in the manner of the Vicar of Bray, it was not surprising that political parties were in a state of flux. Even Tory principles were by no means static during this quarter century from the Glorious Revolution to the Hanoverian Succession. After the Revolution the Tories were in considerable disarray. The old principles of divine right and hereditary succession, which the Tories had upheld during the Exclusion crisis, were, if not abandoned, at least betrayed by the majority of Tories in 1688. Under the stress of James II's attacks on the supremacy of the Anglican Church even Tory stalwarts like the earl of Nottingham, though with great reluctance and only after considerable heart-searching, had felt constrained to abandon the King. When a choice could no longer be avoided the Tories had forsaken their king in order to defend their Church. One principle had been upheld at the expense of another. Yet not all the Tories had been able to make this decision and they became Jacobites and non-jurors. Even the majority of the Tories, who had chosen to safeguard the Anglican Church, tried to avoid the implications of this decision. They had wanted William of Orange to protect their Church and secure their liberties, but they had had no desire to see him as their king. As a result the Tory party, for much of William III's reign, ceased to function as a coherent, organised political group with a clearly defined set of principles. A few Tories, like the earl of Nottingham, were prepared to accept the decision of 1688 and were willing to serve William III, but the majority of the Tory back-benchers remained in sullen opposition.

Thus for several years the political divisions in parliament appeared to be between 'court' and 'country', with the majority of Tories ranged alongside the 'country' opposition. Contemporaries were aware of this and so James Craggs could write, shortly before the death of William III: "All I shall say is that in 3 years we have had 3 parliaments, great struggling in point of party, and notwithstanding all the management of the Court, wch leans entirely to the interest of the Whiggs yet the Church (or Country) Party have at this time an actual majority in the House of Commons."⁵⁵

Any analysis of Tory principles in the reign of William III is complicated by this strong 'court - country' dichotomy cutting across party alignments. However the years 1701-2 form something of a watershed in English history and during the reign of Anne it is possible to see the Whig-Tory division as a political reality and it becomes easier to analyse the nature of the Tory party in these years. There were several reasons for the renewed party rivalry and for the crystallising of conflicting political principles over the main issues of the day. It was the change in the succession problem which was the main reason for the revival of the Tory party as a coherent political body. The death of James II, the doubts about the legitimacy of the Pretender, the recognition of the Pretender by Louis XIV despite treaty obligations to the contrary, and the knowledge that Anne, the daughter

55 B.M.Add.Ms. 22851, f. 121 v. To Governor Thomas Pitt, London, 25 Feb. 1701/2.

of James II, would succeed the childless William III, all helped salve the Tory conscience on the prickly issue of their attitude to the Crown. Old, but tender, wounds could now be allowed to heal and the divergent strands of the Tory party could unite on more than just a 'country' platform. The Tory supporters of the 'country' opposition to William III had helped to pass the Act of Settlement in 1701, not only to safeguard the succession in the protestant interest, but in large measure as an indictment of William himself. The Tories, however, could see a more positive advantage in the impending succession of Anne for this daughter of James II was devoted to the Anglican Church. There was the enticing prospect of being able, once again, to rally to the cause of throne and altar. The undisguised relief and joy of the Tories left them singularly free from Jacobite tendencies at this stage.⁵⁶ Another reason for the clearer party alignment under Anne was the renewal of the war with France. Though Louis XIV's provocative actions in recognising the Pretender and in seeking to control the policies of his grandson, the new king of Spain, united both Whigs and Tories behind the declaration of war there were differences between the two political parties as to the rôle England should play in this new European conflict. The war helped to redefine the policies of the two parties, not only with regard to strategy, but in their attitudes towards the economic repercussions of the war, towards the great

⁵⁶ Bishop Burnet, History of His Own Time (2nd ed.; Oxford, 1833), hereafter cited as Burnet, iv, 497 n.

European powers, and towards foreigners in general. With the renewed party alignment on major issues there emerged determined leaders seeking to rally support to these conflicting principles.

Under the impact of the Hanoverian succession the Whig-Tory division was again destroyed. The Tories were once again faced with the painful decision of Church or King; a crisis they were still unable to meet with a united front. Whereas in 1688 a majority of the Tories had decided to oppose James II, in 1714 only a minority, though an important minority, had decided to give their full support to George I. Though the Jacobites were still in a minority most other Tories shrank from committing themselves to the Hanoverian succession. In contrast the Whigs had no such doubts and they were able to establish a supremacy which the disorganised and divided Tories were never able to destroy. New circumstances were gradually to transform the Whigs too, but it is only under Anne that the Tory party functioned as an active political group, with the ability to dominate parliament and the country. Thus the reign of Anne provides an unique opportunity to study the Tory party for then it upheld clearly defined principles and possessed able leaders and a recognisable organisation.

PART ONE

HENRY ST. JOHN AND THE TORY PARTY, 1702-1714.

Chapter One.

The Principles and Prejudices of the Tory Party.

1.

During the Exclusion crisis the Tories had stood four-square behind the principles of divine right and hereditary succession. After 1688 only the minority of Tories, who became Jacobites or non-jurors, could maintain these principles with undiminished fervour. Yet it would be a mistake to believe that the majority of Tories, who reluctantly accepted the Revolution, readily abandoned their devotion to these principles. The writings of Bishops Lloyd, Stillingfleet, and Tenison, and scores of pamphlets and books by Anglican laymen, indicate that divine right continued to exert an influence on men's minds greater than simply that of a nostalgia for a defunct idea. Many Anglicans even sought to argue that William III owed his throne to the divine right of providence; that God had chosen him as an instrument of punishment and salvation. This divine right of providence was a means of continuing in a modified form the more personal divine right of kings.¹ With the accession of Queen Anne there was an even greater emphasis on the doctrine of divine right. The Queen, herself, was reluctant to lay claim to divine right, perhaps

¹ See Gerald Straka, 'The Final Phase of Divine Right Theory in England, 1688-1702', E.H.R. (1962), lxxvii, 638-658.

because she believed the Pretender was indeed her father's son. When she received a loyal address from the City of London in 1710 Shrewsbury tells us that "she immediately took exception to the expression that 'her right was Divine', and this morning told me that, having thought often of it, she could by no means like it, and thought it so unfit to be given to anybody that she wished it might be left out."² Though the Queen demurred the high-flying Tories enlisted in their cause the old royalist theories of indefeasible hereditary succession and of passive obedience to the commands of the lawful sovereign. There was a great revival of the cult of Charles I as the 'royal martyr' and on 30 January each year his execution was commemorated.³ Many clergymen, notably Dr. Henry Sacheverell, began giving emotional sermons on the subject of loyalty to the Crown.⁴

That the Tories were once again clinging to the doctrine of hereditary right and passive obedience to the lawful sovereign can be illustrated by the furore created by the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell for his famous sermon at St. Paul's on 5 November 1709, which dealt with 'The Perils of False Brethren'. The first article of his impeachment accused him of asserting the doctrine of passive obedience and claimed

2 H.M.C., Bath Mss., 1, 199. Shrewsbury to Robert Harley, 20 Oct. 1710.

3 See, for example, the earl of Rochester's preface to the third volume of Clarendon's History of the Rebellion.

4 For an account of the revival of the doctrine of divine right under Anne, see G. V. Bennett, White Kennett (London, 1957), pp. 86-7.

that his sermon "doth suggest and maintain, That the necessary Means us'd to bring about the said Happy Revolution, were Odious and Unjustifiable."⁵ In his reply to this article Sacheverell vigorously upheld the principle of non-resistance:

"The said Henry Sacheverell doth with all Humility aver the Illegality of Resistance on any Pretence whatsoever to be the Doctrine of the Church of England, and to have been the general Opinion of our most Orthodox and able Divines, from the Time of the Reformation to this Day; this Doctrine hath in the most solemn manner been Taught in that University, where he hath been for more than Twenty Years a Member."⁶

The Whig managers of the impeachment condemned this doctrine as an unwarranted attack on the Revolution. Robert Walpole stated quite categorically that "the Doctrine of unlimited, unconditional Passive Obedience, was first invented to support Arbitrary and Despotick Power."⁷

Here indeed was a conflict of principles. The Sacheverell affair inspired the Tory extremists like the non-juror, Thomas Hearne, who noted in his diary:

"The Whigs and all the Party may by this time see the ill Consequence of the Doctrine advanced by them of the Original of Government's being from the People, and their chief Writers, such as Hoadly, the Review, Kennett, &c ought to be punish'd with the utmost Rigour for maintaining such arguments as give the People a

5 The Tryal of Dr. Henry Sacheverell (London, 1710), p. 8.

6 Ibid., p. 14.

7 Ibid., pp. 91-3.

Power of taking up arms, when they shall think fit."⁸

Yet Sacheverell's opinions were not shared only by an extremist fringe. The majority of the Tories not only supported his arguments to the effect that the Church was in danger, but sympathised with his whole doctrine. His Tory defence counsels had perforce to contend that Sacheverell had no wish to attack the Revolution, but they struggled to uphold his basic principles. Sir Simon Harcourt admitted the justice of the Revolution, but claimed that "the Resistance used at the Revolution is not inconsistent with the Doctrine of the Church of England, and with the Law of England."⁹ Harcourt was really putting forward the view of the 'new' Tories with regard to passive obedience, a view which held that the supreme power resided in the legislature rather than in the Crown. Therefore, there was no infringement of this refined doctrine of passive obedience in 1688 for "the Revolution took effect by the Lords and Commons concurring and assisting in it."¹⁰ Mr. Dodd was somewhat less equivocal: "My Lords, Non-Resistance in general we do assert as a Rule, yet we agree that there is an Exception implied in that Rule, and that Exception, we say, was the Case of the Revolution."¹¹

⁸ Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne, hereafter cited as Hearne, ed. C. E. Doble (Oxford, 1886), ii, 355. A contemporary pamphlet defending Sacheverell was entitled A Defence of Dr. Sacheverell, or Passive Obedience prov'd to be the Doctrine of the Church of England (London, 1710).

⁹ The Tryal of Dr. Henry Sacheverell, p. 182.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 179.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 201.

The average Tory, free of the need to defend passive obedience before Lords or Commons, was less inhibited in his assertions and would hardly have appreciated Harcourt's refinements. The trial brought forth a positive flood of Tory addresses to the Queen, not only in defence of the Church, but in defence of the royal prerogative. In the Gloucester Address the Tories declared: "We are now, and always shall be, ready to sacrifice our Lives and Fortunes, in Defence of Your Majesty's most Sacred Person, Prerogative, and Government."¹² The Address from the borough of Warwick included the promise: "We will continue to choose such Representatives, as shall have the profoundest Veneration for your Majesty, [and] shall assert and maintain Your Hereditary Title."¹³ The Tories of Westminster wrote: "We detest, with Indignation, those newly receiv'd Doctrines in favour of Resistance, which may make such ill Impressions in the Minds of the People, as will endanger the Safety of our happy Constitution."¹⁴ The Tory doctrine was probably couched in its most extreme form in the Address from the City of Lincoln, presented by its Tory M.P., Sir Thomas Meeres:

12 A Collection of the Addresses which have been presented to the Queen, since the Impeachment of the Reverend Dr. Henry Sacheverell (London, 1711), i, 1. Hereafter cited as A Collection of the Addresses.

13 Ibid., i, 6.

14 Ibid., i, 10.

"We beg Leave to declare our utter Abhorrence of such Persons who despise all reveal'd Religion, and the Power thereof; who disavow Obedience and Non-Resistance, the essential Ligaments of a well-established Monarchy, and who seem to deny what the Scriptures dictate unto us, That all Power is of God, and that they that do resist shall receive unto themselves Condemnation."¹⁵

Divine right, hereditary succession, and passive obedience may have revived in the reign of Anne partly through relief following the death of Dutch William and partly through a foreboding that such principles would not long survive Anne's death. The demise of James II and William III released the Tories from the restraint imposed upon their loyalty to the Crown by the existence of rival claimants to the throne. The Tories could not conceal their joy at the accession of Anne. Lord Normanby, later duke of Buckingham, wrote to the earl of Nottingham: "I believe it unnecessary to inform your L[or]d[shi]p of the K[ing]'s dying on Sunday morning and of the Queen's being proclaimed that afternoon with the greatest appearance of Joy among all sorts of people, that ever I yet saw on the like occasion."¹⁶ It soon became obvious that the satisfaction of the Tories could never be permanent for it was clear that the Queen would never produce any heir of her body. The Tories had little enthusiasm for a German prince and they could no longer seriously uphold the 'warming-pan theory'

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, ii, 7.

¹⁶ Leicester Record Office, Finch Mss., box vi, bundle 22. Normanby to Nottingham, Arlington House, 10 March 1701/2.

as a reason for not recognising the Pretender. Throughout her reign the Tories were uneasily aware that the Queen's death would herald a crisis of conscience for some of them and for all of them it would sound the death-knell for divine right and hereditary succession unless they espoused the Jacobite cause. Indeed during Anne's reign the Tories had occasionally to face the dilemma of how to square their declared principles with the exclusion of the Pretender. The earl of Nottingham, though he had been for a time secretary of state to William III, was in a quandary about the oath of abjuration of the Pretender, prescribed in the last months of William's reign. He sought the advice of his friend John Sharp, the Tory archbishop of York, who reassured him:

"When we declare that we do Abjure any Allegiance to the Pr[ince] of W[ales] there can certainly no more be meant, than that we declare upon Oath that we will pay no Allegiance to him.

In truth according to my notion of things whoever can take the Oath of Allegiance to the present Queen, may safely take the Oath of Abjuration as to the Pr[ince] of W[ales] for they are but the two contradictory drawn out into Promises upon Oath; I am of Opinion that they [Princes] Hold their Crowns by the same Legall Right that yor Lords[h]ip holds yor Estate, and that they may forfeite their Rights as well as you may do yors."¹⁷

¹⁷ Ibid. Archbishop Sharp to Nottingham, Bishopsthorpe, 31 March 1701/2. Nottingham's first letter to the archbishop, dated 10 Jan. 1701/2, was published by A. Tindal Hart, The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York (London, 1949), p. 332.

Nottingham's reply was an excellent illustration of the perplexed Tory conscience:

"I apprehend the argument is founded upon a principle, which I can't entirely come up to, and therefore, since it is the duty of a subject actively to obey, as far as is consistent with his own conscience, I have been endeavouring to draw the conclusion from my own premises, such principles I mean as I have been bred up in tho' of late they have been much out of fashion, that I might Reconcile my practice to my faith."¹⁸

Later the same year Nottingham's conscience was troubled over the propriety of Lord Winchelsea kissing the hand of the Electress Sophia. In a letter to his friend and fellow secretary of state, Sir Charles Hedges, he suggested that only a sovereign's children should be paid such respects and he voiced the hope that the Queen might still beget an heir of her own body.¹⁹

The whole Tory party sympathised with those who, in all conscience, hesitated to take the oath of abjuration. On 27 February 1703 the Tories in the Commons passed a bill, entitled 'An Act for enlarging the time for taking the Oath of Abjuration'. In the Lords three amendments were passed: no person, who had already lost his post for not taking the oath, should be restored to it if it had been filled by someone else; anyone, who endeavoured to hinder the lawful successor from ascending the throne, would be guilty of high treason; the abjuration oath should be extended to Ireland. The amended bill

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 333.

¹⁹ Northants Record Office, Finch-Hatton Mss., vol. 275, ff. 86-7.
Nottingham to Hedges, Burley, 14 Sept. 1702.

required a more unequivocal declaration of loyalty to the Hanoverian succession and when, on 13 February, these alterations were considered by the Commons there was a sharp division on party lines over the first amendment.²⁰ One hundred and eighteen Whigs voted to agree with the Lords' first amendment and one hundred and seventeen Tories voted in opposition.²¹ After this very narrow defeat the Tories gave up any

²⁰ Commons' Journals, xiv, 194.

²¹ There are, in all, five lists incorporating three different versions of this division. None of the versions correspond exactly to the actual number of votes recorded in this division and all the lists name thirteen members who could not have been in the House when the division took place. The lists are, therefore, not entirely trustworthy and are only really useful as lists of well-known Whigs and Tories. See W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-14: A Study in Political Organisation', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis, pp. 60-64 and 442-5. That the minority of 117 members, or 119 counting the two tellers, were accurately identified as Tories can be seen by comparing the versions of this list with all the other extant voting lists for Anne's reign. Such an examination shows that only twenty-three of those members in the minority ever registered a vote against the Tory interest. Of these eleven were Hanoverian Tories, who opposed the commercial treaty with France in 1713, viz. Ralph Freeman, George Pitt, Robert Haysham, William Levinz, Roger Mostyn, Morgan Randyll, Richard Reynell, John Thorold, George Warburton, John Ward, and James Winstanley. Heysham, Pitt, and Thorold also voted against the expulsion of Richard Steele from the Commons in 1714. Another seven on this list voted for the Whig, John Smith, as Speaker in 1705, but Smith was also the Court choice and six of these seven held places at this time, viz., George Granville (governor of Pendennis), Sir Simon Harcourt (solicitor-general), Thomas King (lieut.-governor of Sheerness), Sir Thomas Mansell (comptroller of the household), Edward Nicholas (treasurer to Prince George) and Henry St. John (secretary at war). The seventh, William Bromley, was Smith's opponent for the Speakership and he voted for him as a matter of form. Granville, Harcourt, Nicholas, and St. John also voted for the Court in 1706 on an amendment to the Regency bill, when they were joined by Arthur Moore (comptroller of the army accounts). Henry Cornewall, a major anxious to secure a regiment, voted against the peace in 1711, while Sir Francis Child and Frederick Herne, two prominent London financiers, opposed the

opposition to the other two clauses for opposition to the second clause would lead to them being charged with Jacobitism.²²

The Tory doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance were so ingrained that they could even be used to enjoin support for the Hanoverian succession. A Tory Address from Anglesey to the new king, George I, could still congratulate him upon his accession in 'high-Church' prose: "Wee have been always educated in those principles of loyalty and obedience which are taught by the Church of England and enforced by the laws, which both command us to abhor the doctrine of resistance and the practice of sedition in the State and strictly enjoyn us to support the right of your Matie and your royal house to the imperial crown of this realme."²³ High Tory doctrines, however, like divine right and passive obedience only occasionally figured prominently among the political issues of the day. More often Whigs and Tories were divided on their conflicting attitudes to the royal prerogative and the question of a limited monarchy. Whereas the Whigs were ever ready to defend the

South Sea bill of the same year. Finally Thomas Coke should really be classed as a courtier for he always voted with the Court, whether it was Whig or Tory. He voted for a Whig Court in 1705, 1709, and 1710. Thus the thirty-two non-Tory votes by these twenty-three members are explicable without being able to charge any of them with being a genuine Whig. It should be remembered that ninety-six members on this list, including the two tellers, never appeared on any of the non-Tory lists and that the 119 members on the list cast 218 Tory votes to contrast with the thirty-two non-Tory votes.

22 See The Miscellaneous Works of Bishop Atterbury, ed. J. Nichols (London, 1789-98), 1, 166. Atterbury to Trelawney, 13 Feb. 1702/3.

23 Bangor University College Library. Baron Hill Ms., 6776. Dated 8 Oct. 1714.

Revolution, which implied certain limitations on the royal authority, the Tories tended to emphasise the power and prestige of the sovereign.

Swift wrote of the Tories:

"As they prefer a well-regulated monarchy before all other forms of government; so they think it next to impossible to alter that institution here, without involving our whole island in blood and desolation. They believe, that the prerogative of a sovereign ought, at least, to be held as sacred and inviolable as the rights of his people, if only for this reason, because without a due share of power, he will not be able to protect them."²⁴

Such declarations were not merely propaganda. A Court Tory, like Thomas Coke, could genuinely claim: "The rule I have laid down to myself is to support ye Prerogative of ye Crown in all points, as much as in me lies."²⁵ Henry St. John, who did not readily accept restrictions on his political ambition, always acknowledged the Queen's prerogative. In 1706 he wrote to the duke of Marlborough: "There are some restless spirits who are foolishly imagined to be the heads of a party, who make much noise and have no real strength, that expect the queen, crowned with success abroad, and governing without blemish at home, should court them at the expense of her own authority."²⁶ During the great debates on the

²⁴ The Examiner, no. 35. 5 April 1711.

²⁵ Huntington Library, California. Stowe Ms. 58, v, f. 126. Coke to James Brydges, 15 Feb. 1709/10.

²⁶ Cited by T. Macknight, The Life of Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke (London, 1863), p. 106. St. John to Marlborough, 12/23 Nov. 1706.

peace preliminaries in December 1711 the Tories showed their genuine doubts about the propriety of giving unsolicited advice to the Queen on questions of foreign policy. Charles Eversfield, a member of the October Club, opposed Walpole's amendment, of 'no peace without Spain', "par respect pour la Reine ... Sa Majesté n'ayant demandé leur avis."²⁷ In the Lords twenty peers registered a protest against the same amendment, put by Nottingham on 8 December 1711, on the grounds that it was unconstitutional even for the Lords to tender advice on such matters without a request from the Queen.²⁸

The Tory emphasis on the royal prerogative was not, of course, devoid of self-interest. The Queen favoured the Tories as the supporters of the Church of England²⁹ and they had everything to gain from insisting on the Queen's right, among others, to dispose of places of

27 B.M.Add.Ms. 17677, EEE, f. 391. L'Hermitage to the States General, 11 Dec. 1711.

28 Lords' Journals, xix, 339. Of the twenty dissenting peers listed here only Thomas Manningham, bishop of Chichester, was not a Tory. Beaufort, Berkshire, Denbigh, North and Grey, Northumberland, Osborne, Plymouth, Stawell, Sussex, Thanet, Willoughby de Broke, and Yarmouth all voted Sacheverell not guilty in 1710. Cardigan had recently renounced the Roman Catholic faith and was made master of the buckhounds by the Tory ministry in 1712. Clarendon was from a Tory family, became a P.C. in Dec. 1711 and was sent as envoy-extraordinary to Hanover in May 1714. Delawar and Scarsdale voted for the Occasional Conformity bill in 1703. Hatton was a young peer of a Tory family. The bishops of Bristol and St. Davids were promoted to their sees for their Toryism; the bishop of Bristol was one of the British plenipotentiaries at Utrecht.

29 See the Queen's letter to Lady Marlborough, 24 Oct. 1702, in The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne, ed. B. Curtis Brown (London, 1935), pp. 98-99.

profit and power. A recent work has traced the conversion of the Tory party, from support of the royal authority to the idea that ministers should be responsible to parliament, to the years 1697-1702.³⁰ After this period, however, the Tories' views on the responsibility of ministers tended to change according to the prevailing circumstances. In 1711 the Tories attacked the late Whig ministry for advising an offensive war in Spain, which had led to Galway's defeat at Almanza in 1707. The earl of Sunderland justified that ministry's conduct by showing a letter in which the Queen had expressed her approval of this policy. The Tory earl of Rochester replied that "he knew very well the meaning of that objection, that for several years past they had been told, 'That the Queen was to answer for everything', but he hoped that time was over; that according to the fundamental constitution of this Kingdom, the ministers are accountable for all, and therefore he hoped nobody would, nay dared, name the Queen in this debate."³¹ Rochester naturally had no wish to miss an opportunity to censure the Whigs. Three years later the boot was on the other foot. On 5 April 1714 the Tory Lord Harcourt proposed to substitute 'under Her Majesty's administration' for 'under the present administration' in the motion declaring the Protestant succession in danger. The Whigs protested that the Queen should not be mentioned, "for by our constitution, the sovereign

30 Clayton Roberts, The Growth of Responsible Government in Stuart England (Cambridge, 1966), pp. 286-328.

31 History and Defence of the Last Parliament (London, 1713), pp. 45-46.

can do no wrong; and if anything be done amiss, the ministers alone are accountable," but the Tories carried the day by 77 to 63 votes.³² In 1715 the impeached Tory leaders pleaded that in negotiating the treaty of Utrecht they were merely obeying the Queen's lawful commands, while the Whigs blamed them for advising the Queen to make peace.³³ Clearly the question of the royal prerogative was subject to the demands of political convenience, but the Tories tended on most occasions to regard it with greater reverence than ever the Whigs accorded it.

ii.

Apart from the occasional outburst like the spate of loyal addresses in 1710 the Tories refrained from laying too much stress on doctrines like divine right and hereditary succession. They realised that to do so would emphasise their betrayal of James II in 1688 or encourage their opponents to smear them as crypto-Jacobites waiting for an opportunity to restore the Pretender. Moreover it only opened old wounds and stirred guilty consciences within the Tory ranks. The Tories would continue to be wracked by doubts about their decision in 1688 if they always reminded themselves of the doctrines of divine right, hereditary succession, and passive obedience. Instead, in order to cover

32 William Cobbett's Parliamentary History (London, 1810), vi, 1335 and Lords' Journals, xix, 647, 659.

33 Clayton Roberts, The Growth of Responsible Government in Stuart England, pp. 393-5.

the fissures in their party, the Tories stressed their common devotion to the Church of England. After their decision in 1688 to safeguard their Church at the expense of their King they can more accurately be labelled as the Church party. Yet Professor Walcott³⁴ was not alone in attaching little significance to religious principles or prejudices. In the general instructions given to Gaultier, the French agent, in October 1710, the French Court suggested that the religious differences between Whigs and Tories were merely used as a pretext to rally support to their respective parties:

"Il est connu à tout le monde qu'il y en a deux présentement qui divisent l'Angleterre: l'un composé de ceux qui font profession d'estre particulièrement attachés aux règles estroittes de l'Eglise Anglicane; l'autre de ceux qui sont Presbytériens, ou qui suivent encore en apparence quelques unes des maximes de cette mesme Eglise admettant cependant indifféramment toute sorte de secte. La Religion ne sert que de prétexte et comme de signal à l'un et à l'autre party pour couvrir ses veues particulières et pour réunir ses forces."³⁵

To accept such opinions would entail ignoring a great mass of evidence; not only Tory propaganda, but Tory views expressed in private correspondence and Tory activity in both the political and ecclesiastical spheres.

Throughout the reign of Queen Anne the Tories did use the cry of 'the Church in danger' as a means of rallying support and damaging the Whigs. In The True Picture of a Modern Whig, published in two parts

34 In his English Politics in the Early Eighteenth Century, Robert Walcott pays no heed to religious issues or indeed any other questions of principles that divided Whig from Tory.

35 P.R.O. Baschet transcripts, 31/3/196, f. 320 v.

1701-2, Charles Davenant attacked the Whigs for want of loyalty to the Church. Thomas Double was portrayed as accosting Mr. Whiglove: "I dont see why you should not still continue your wonted Practice of Ridiculing the Church and all Reveal'd Religion."³⁶ Following the Tory split over the Tack in 1704 and after the general election of 1705 a printed broadsheet was distributed purporting to show which members of the new parliament were 'True Church', 'High Ch[urch]', 'L[ow] Church', 'No Church', etc.³⁷ In 1705 there was published the very influential Tory pamphlet, The Memorial of the Church of England, in which Dr. James Drake proclaimed 'the Church in danger'. On its appearance the non-juror, Thomas Hearne, noted: "Just publish'd 'The Memorial of the Church of England', a pamphlet in 4to, wherein divers intrigues of a great Minister of State [Godolphin] are discovered, and the Designs of the Whigs for destroying the Church are manifested."³⁸ Tory propaganda of this nature reached its peak at the Sacheverell trial in 1710. Dr. Sacheverell's famous sermon of 5 November 1709 had proclaimed that the Church was in danger from 'false brethren'. The high Church storm aroused by his impeachment was an eloquent testimony to the popular fears felt for the safety of the Church.³⁹ The flood of loyal addresses to the Queen in 1710 reveals the strength of current popular sentiment. In

³⁶ Part i, p. 62.

³⁷ A copy can be seen in B. M. Stowe Ms. 354, ff. 161-2.

³⁸ Hearne (Oxford, 1885), i, 3.

³⁹ See particularly Mary Ransome, 'Church and Dissent in the Election of 1710', E.H.R. (1941), lvi, 76-89.

the Address from Bridgnorth, for example, the signatories promised "to elect such Members as are Men of Monarchical Principles, Members of the Church of England, and Maintainers of her sound and pure Doctrines."⁴⁰

The supporters of the Address from Westbury declared: We "shall, to our utmost Power, oppose those Schismatical and Republican Spirits, whom nothing can content but the Extirpation of Episcopacy out of the Church."⁴¹

Pamphlets and loyal addresses were used for propaganda purposes, but the Tory party's defence of the Church of England was never merely a convenient and popular public stance. The devotion of many Tories to the Church was a genuine conviction, upheld in their private correspondence. Sir Justinian Isham, the staunch Tory member for Northants, wrote to his son, who was touring Europe: "I am very glad also of your Resolution to adhere firmly to the C[hurch] of England wch I can never doubt, None of our family being any other ways inclin'd, and tho' you may meet wth some abroad of other Principles wch they may endeavour to instill into young Gentlemen, I dare say their Labour will be lost wth you."⁴² In another letter he wrote: "I am not a little pleas'd that the English Liturgy is us'd sometimes, for above all things

⁴⁰ A Collection of the Addresses, ii, 14.

⁴¹ Ibid., i, 17.

⁴² Northants Record Office. Isham Family Letters, bundle 6. Isham to his son, Justinian, at Wolfenbuttel, 11 Dec. 1705.

remember to be firm to the Church of England."⁴³ When it came to elections the Tory gentry laid great stress on any candidate of theirs being a staunch supporter of the Church of England. In 1705 Ralph Palmer congratulated the Tory, Lord Fermanagh, on his electoral success: "I am very glad of yr success at Buckingham, and that your L[ordshi]p (at this low tide of Ch[urch] Interest) was so instrumental in ye promotion of an honest Churchman."⁴⁴ Two years later Lord Fermanagh himself was writing to Lord Bridgewater: "Since my Lord you have three candidates for the county, I must suppose Col. Egerton to be of the Church side, if so I wish him Good Luck to be one of the Elected."⁴⁵ Robert Harley heard from Lord Cheyne in 1710: "We are hard at work for our County Election not without great hopes of choosing both knights in ye Church Interrest."⁴⁶ Any candidate who wished to secure Tory support could not afford to be suspected of backsliding in his devotion to the interests of the Church. Thomas Coke, a courtier and a crony of Henry St. John, lost his Derbyshire seat in 1710 for voting against Dr. Sacheverell. In 1705 Hugh Boscawen, a Whig courtier whose chance of success in the Cornwall election was threatened, had to emphasise his support for the Church:

⁴³ Ibid., bundle 7. Letter dated 6 Nov. 1705.

⁴⁴ Buckinghamshire Record Office. Verney Mss. (microfilm of the papers at Claydon House). Letter dated 19 Dec. 1705.

⁴⁵ Ibid. Letter dated 22 Dec. 1707.

⁴⁶ B. M. Portland (Harley papers). Loan 29/130/2. Letter dated 23 Sept. 1710.

"The divisions among our clergy here," wrote Blackburne to William Wake, "are hotly fomented by the Gentry also of one sort, chiefly on the account of my Lord's [Trelawny's] very vigorous acting in favour of Mr. Boscawen, who is represented by 'em as a bitter Whig tho' he declared himself so fully to the Gentry at Launceston as to be ready to venture his estate & life for the interest of the Church of England."⁴⁷

Tories tended, moreover, to view election results in terms of the strength and weakness of the Church interest. After some Tory reverses in 1705 Lord Fermanagh learned: "The Whiggs is mitley pleased, so thinking the day is ther owne, and that they shall quite run downe the poore Church of England but I hope theyl never Accomplish that wicked desine, I dout not but God will defend his Church, tho' he suffars itt to be punisht for a time."⁴⁸ In 1713 the Tories achieved a great electoral triumph and a Mrs. Cocks wrote to her brother: "I should hope yu are all mighty happy & joyful for ye good success of ye Church party have in all their Elections. If it be possible I believe there will be fewer of ye Faction in ys House of Commons yn ye last wch I hope will make all our hearts easier."⁴⁹

In the reign of Anno fears for the position of the Church of England became a major religious and political issue. In 1689 the Tories had agreed, without having had much time to deliberate, to grant toleration to Dissenters. The threat from catholicism under James II had

⁴⁷ Christ Church Library, Oxford University. Wake Mss. Arch. W. Epist., vol. 17, f. 97. L. Blackburne to Wake, Calstock, 14 May 1705.

⁴⁸ Verney Letters of the Eighteenth Century, ed. Lady Verney (London, 1930), p. 168. Elizabeth Adams to Fermanagh, 5 Nov. 1705.

⁴⁹ Surrey Record Office. Somers Ms. O/2/58. Letter dated 8 Sept. 1713.

appeared to be so dangerous that an alliance of protestants seemed called for. Under William III the Tories began to resent the growing influence of the Dissenters, to repent of toleration, and to become alarmed at the growing threat to the Established Church.⁵⁰ The Tories became convinced that the King and the Whigs were united in a determination to crush the Church party and to destroy the privileges of the Anglican Church. In 1702 Charles Allestree wrote: "The Members of the Church of England were never threaten'd with so much danger from popery, as they were from a set of men that he [William III] countenanc'd and abetted in their wicked contrivance to destroy the Establish'd Church."⁵¹ Queen Anne herself shared the Tory prejudice on this question. To Lady Marlborough she confessed: "As to my saying the Church was in some danger in the late reign, I cannot alter my opinion; for though there was no violent thing done, everybody that will speak impartially must own that everything was leaning towards the Whigs, and whenever that is so, I shall think the Church beginning to be in danger."⁵² Many of the Anglican clergy believed that the Toleration Act was weakening the bonds of the Church. One clergyman appealed to the Tory archbishop of York:

⁵⁰ See M. A. Thomson, 'The Safeguarding of the Protestant Succession', History (1954), xxxix, 42-3.

⁵¹ B.M.Add.Ms. 27440, f. 84. Allestree to Dr. John Younger. No date, but almost certainly 1702.

⁵² Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne, ed. B. Curtis Brown, p. 99. Letter dated St. James's, 21 Nov. 1702-4.

"If ye Toleration Act be continued in force as it is, without any alteration it seems impossible to keep up any due discipline in ye Established Ch[urch] because if pastors admonish, suspend or excommunicate any proud, stubborn, or conceited persons, as just occasion may require according to ye nature of their offence, whether it be for profanely or idly absenting from all religious worship (wch is now commonly done) or for anything else; they will utterly contemn & despise it, since they can herd ymselves (under a pretence of conscience) amongst some of ye Tolerated Dissenters."⁵³

The lower clergy genuinely felt their position to be threatened by the Dissenters, whom they believed to be rapidly increasing in numbers. They had originally welcomed Defoe's The Shortest Way with the Dissenters, and their fury, when they realised the irony behind his suggestions, illustrated their genuine desire to be rid of the Dissenters. Samuel Wesley wrote to Bishop Wake: "I saw the growing power & insolence of the dissenters & their party, & that the church, the clergy & the Universitys were every day insulted in their writings."⁵⁴

William III was also accused by the Tories of having attempted to undermine the Church from within, a charge not entirely without substance. He had not called convocation from 1689 to 1701 and he was always suspected of appointing only low churchmen to the bishops' bench,

53 Borthwick Institute, York. Sharp Mss. (microfilm of originals at Gloucester Record Office), bundle 3 R. 'A country divine' to Archbishop Sharp, 2 Feb. 1705/6.

54 Christ Church Library, Oxford University. Wake Mss. Arch. W. Epist., Lincoln Letters, vol. i, letter 15. Letter dated Lincoln Castle, 4 Oct. 1705.

though this is a charge which has recently been refuted.⁵⁵ In 1701 the convocation was revived. The result was a prolonged clash throughout Anne's reign between the majority of the lower clergy, who had high-church predilections, and the more Whiggish bishops of the upper house of convocation. In this struggle the lower clergy could count upon the support of the Tory party. Francis Atterbury, who was one of the leading spokesmen of the lower house of convocation, was soon in league with the more moderate Tories in the Commons. Thomas Rowney told Dr. Charlett of the Commons' address to the Queen at the beginning of her first parliament:

"We particularly ordered our thanks for the care of the Church of England. Which expression of her Majesty's and the committee we appointed for religion gave Sir Edw. Seymour occasion to take notice of the Bishops' usage of the Lower House of Convocation (whom he thought the most proper committee for Religion) But could never be suffered to sit to bring things to bear for fear of having some of their own books and heretical doctrines censured and exposed."⁵⁶

The convocation crisis mirrored the party struggle in parliament and became a political and religious attack by high church Tories and clergy upon the Whig dominated bench of bishops. Bishop Gibson later asserted that "the Convocation controversy was raised on purpose to render the

55 G. V. Bennett, 'King William III and the Episcopate', Essays in Modern English Church History in memory of Norman Sykes, ed. G. V. Bennett and J. D. Walsh (London, 1966), pp. 104-131.

56 Bodleian Library, Oxford. Ballard Ms. 38, f. 187. Letter dated London, 24 Oct. 1702.

archbishop [Tenison], and that part of the bench which had distinguished itself in favour of the Protestant succession, odious to the nation; as if they were destroying the constitution of the Church and liberties of the inferior clergy."⁵⁷ Fortunately for the Tories the Queen sympathised with the Churchmen and they could generally count upon her support. In the early years of her reign the low church bishops were in a majority,⁵⁸ but most of the vacancies which appeared in their ranks were subsequently filled with high churchmen ^{of moderate Tory leanings.} The Queen was rarely on harmonious terms with her Whig ministers and the promotions from the ranks of Whig clergymen were hard-won and comparatively rare.⁵⁹

The religious issue clearly divided the parties in parliament. John Wyndham told Thomas Pitt: "Our Parliament members have divided themselves into High and Low Church. The High Church are for observing the rubric and ceremonies. The Low Church men go to our Church, but so far flatter the dissenters as at any time to have their assistance at elections, and consequently the best places at Court, Army and Navy."⁶⁰

57 Christ Church Library, Oxford University. Wake Mss. Arch. W. Epist., 6, Canterbury Letters, vol. i. Gibson to William Wake, 4 Feb. 1715/16.

58 When the Lords voted on the Occasional Conformity bill of 1703 only nine bishops were found to support it while fourteen opposed it. Ebenezer Timberland, The History and Proceedings of the House of Lords, hereafter cited as Lords' Debates, (London, 1742), 11, 70.

59 See especially Norman Sykes, 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', E.H.R. (1935), 1, 433-464.

60 H.M.C., Fortescue Mss., 1, 19. Letter dated London, 27 Jan. 1705/6. Cf. ibid, 1, 33. Same to same, London, 18 Dec. 1707.

In the political sphere the Tories regularly strived to introduce measures which would safeguard or promote the Anglican religion. William Bromley, probably the leading high church Tory of the reign, brought into the Commons all the first three abortive Occasional Conformity bills. His sincerity can hardly be questioned, though his language might appear unreasonable:

"The fanatics," he wrote to Dr. Charlett, "could not be more dejected in Bucks than they seem at present everywhere else. Most of them are very quiet and silent, tho' some talk of persecution, they foresee its approaches, & their liberty of conscience they expect will be taken from them. The abuse of it I hope will, & a stop put to that abominable Hypocrisy, that inexcusable Immorality of occasional conformity. I believe no one intends anything further, & if this can be obtained it will probably cure most of the evils we now labour under."⁶¹

Many high church Tories insisted on supporting the Occasional Conformity bill at all costs and in 1704 one hundred and thirty four Tories went so far as to tack the bill to the land tax. For these tackers the supplies for the war could await the safeguarding of the Church. They were even willing to lose the favour of the Queen, who resented matters being carried to such extremes, and so their convictions seem indisputable if impolitic. Similarly, throughout the reign, a large body of Tories kept the Church issue to the fore and fought at every opportunity to protect its interests. They opposed the clause in the Act of Union, which granted the Presbyterian Church of Scotland the

⁶¹ Bodleian Library Oxford. Ballard Ms. 38, f. 137. Letter dated 22 Oct. 1702.

privileges of the established church in Scotland. The Tory attacks on the Union were primarily based on ecclesiastical grounds and a vain amendment by Archbishop Sharp, to include the Test Act among those measures to guarantee the security of the Church of England, had the full support of the high churchmen.⁶² In 1710 the Tories were vigorous supporters of Dr. Sacheverell and supported both the Occasional Conformity and the Schism acts. The Commons were alarmed to learn in 1711 that the number of Dissenters' meeting-houses outnumbered that of Anglican churches by two to one⁶³ in the London area, and on 8 May 1711 a sum of £350,000 was voted for building fifty new churches in London.⁶⁴

It was the Tory party's devotion to the Church of England that prevented all but a minority becoming Jacobites. They had forsaken James II to save their Church and the Tories could never, in a body, accept the Pretender while he remained a Roman Catholic. Bolingbroke recognised this when he urged the Pretender to declare his adherence to the Anglican Church. Gaultier informed Torcy of Bolingbroke's advice: "Le Grand Turc sera plutost Roy d'Angleterre que le Chevalier tant qu'il sera Catholique Romain; ce sont les dernieres paroles que m'ont dit Mylord Bolingbroke et plus de trente autres."⁶⁵ Yet this realisation

62 G. Every, The High Church Party 1688-1718 (London, 1956), p. 121.

63 English Historical Documents 1660-1714, ed. Andrew Browning (London, 1953), viii, 427.

64 Commons' Journals, xvi, 643.

65 L. G. Wickham Legg, 'Extracts from Jacobite Correspondence 1712-14', E.H.R. (1915), xxx, 517. Letter dated London, 29 March 1714.

did not prevent the Tories hankering for a restoration of an Anglican 'James III'. They suffered from a natural human desire to have their cake and eat it. Their nostalgia for divine right and hereditary succession was always pulling them in the opposite direction to their love of the Established Church. By not turning their backs resolutely on the former, and on their past, the Tories lacked a coherent political philosophy with which to face a difficult future. The Tory party always threatened to split between Jacobites and high churchmen.

iii.

The Tories not only evinced different political and religious opinions to the Whigs, but claimed a social distinction, for they regarded themselves as the embodiment of the landed interest. In later life Bolingbroke declared that in Anne's reign "we supposed the Tory party to be the bulk of the landed interest, and to have no contrary influence blended into its composition."⁶⁶ Swift, in 1712, taunted the Whigs with the jibe that "it has been the old Complaint of your Party, that the Body of Country Gentlemen always leaned too much (since the Revolution) to the Tory-side."⁶⁷ A more independent witness admitted

66 A Letter to Sir William Wyndham (London, 1753), p. 20. This work was written in 1717.

67 The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford, 1939-57), hereafter cited as Swift's Prose Works, vi, 126. Cf. "I remember it was a usual complaint among the Whigs, that the Bulk of Landed-Men was not in their Interests" The Examiner, no. 14, 9 Nov. 1710. Ibid., iii, 12.

that "the majority of the gentry upon a poll will be found Torys."⁶⁸ Indeed the Whigs themselves seem to have recognised this fact for Marlborough's Whig chaplain, Dr. Francis Hare, wrote to the duchess in 1710: "There seems little room to hope the Tories should not be the majority. I must own I thought it would be so from the first; for it has always seemed to me very plain that the spirit of the gentry of the nation is Toryism, and that nothing but the influence of the Court has made it otherwise in any Parliament."⁶⁹ A contemporary Whig pamphlet asked ironically: "Can we imagine that Persons who have two such Interests on their side, as a Church Interest and a Land Interest will be mindful of so Paltry an Interest as Trade."⁷⁰

The Tories regarded the landed class, which they claimed to represent, as a separate interest, hostile to and attacked by the moneyed interest. It was their constant charge that their vested interest in land suffered to the advantage of the financial classes. At the beginning of Anne's reign the malt and the land taxes were arousing the ire of the Tories. In the debates upon the malt tax in the last month of William's life one M.P. said:

68 Christ Church Library, Oxford. Wake Mss. Arch. W. Epist., vol. 17, misc. 1, letter 243. W. Wotton to Bishop Wake, 21 March 1710.

69 The Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough (London, 1838), 1, 399. Letter dated St. Andre, 30 Oct. 1710.

70 [Charles Davenant?], Toryism and Trade can never agree (London, n.d.), p. 16.

"A merchant finds a better return between the Excheq[ue]r & the Exchange than he makes by running a hazard to the Indies. The great preferments, the high Interest, the notable way of stock jobbing; the advancing upon funds have invited, nay tempted them to trade at home; even to turn pirates upon their own country, so that our comodities & nation's product lye dead; & yt mony wch should carry on Trade & buy up our country growth is turn'd another way & we continually drudge to pay their great & heavy interests A great deal goes to keep up this sort of state & bravery, and yet I am certain yt some of these Gent[leme]n not many years agoe were scarce able to keep a pad nag & a drab coat; and now a Gent[lema]n of 5000 ll p. ann. is not a fitt companion for their greatness."⁷¹

A few weeks later an anonymous correspondent criticised Robert Harley for not safeguarding the landed interest:

"We find yourself and Sir C[hristopher] Musgrave, our two worthy patriots and men of integrity, have mortgaged all the landed gentlemen of England till 1710, by continuing the grand mortgage till that time; though you both vehemently opposed that mortgage at first, and afterwards the continuation of it for a longer term. People will be apt to think you have either bought up malt tickets at a great discount, or you have a mind to make yourself popular though you ruin all the landed gentlemen of England, who are already for the most part undone."⁷²

As the country got deeper and deeper into the European conflict the ministers had to find more and more money. By 1707 the Commons were voting supplies of six million pounds for the war, with nearly half coming from the land and malt taxes, nearly a million coming from customs and excise, and the rest had to be borrowed, mostly from the

⁷¹ Bodleian Library, Oxford. Carte Ms. 117 f. 117 v. A speech of an honourable member of the House of Commons, 19 Feb. 1701/2.

⁷² H.M.C., Portland Mss., viii, 96. Letter dated London, 10 Mar. 1701/2.

Bank of England. The Tories opposed this,⁷³ perhaps feeling they paid out heavily while the Whig financiers benefitted from lending at five per cent. The cost of the war placed increasing strain on the Tory country gentlemen. In October 1707 William Bromley was lamenting: "I believe all country Gentlemen are under the like pressures & uneasiness, & all cannot so well bear them. Tenants are breaking every day, & the quarterly payments of the taxes take away the little money we receive."⁷⁴ While out of parliament during the years 1708-10 Henry St. John spent much of his time on his estates at Bucklebury, where he reabsorbed the prejudices and opinions of the average country gentlemen. By 1709 he was convinced the gentry had turned against a war, which was coming near to ruining them. He conveyed these sentiments to his friend, Lord Orrery:

"We have now been twenty years engaged in the two most expensive wars that Europe ever saw. The whole burthen of this charge has lain upon the landed interest during the whole time. The men of estates have generally speaking, neither served in the Fleets nor armies, nor meddled in the public funds & management of the Treasure.

A new Interest has been created out of their Fortunes, & a sort of property wch was not known twenty years ago, is now encreased to be almost equal to the terra firma of our island. The consequence of all this is that the landed men are become poor & dispirited. They either abandon all thoughts of the public, turn arrant farmers, & improve the Estates they have left: or

73 H.M.C., Fortescue Mss., i, 28. Robert Raworth to Thomas Pitt, London, 7 Feb. 1706/7. The Tories always opposed increases in taxation of any sort. See Plumb's Political Stability, pp. 149-51.
74 Levens Hall, Westmorland. Bagot Mss., box B, file B 2. Bromley to James Grahme, Eydon, 11 Oct. 1707.

else they seek to repair their shattered fortunes by listing at Court, or under the Heads of Partys. In the meanwhile those men are become their masters, who formerly would with joy have been their servants. To judge therefore rightly of what turn our domestic affairs are in any respect likely to take, we must for the future only consider what the temper of the Court, & of the Bank, is."⁷⁵

This mood of the country gentleman played a large part in the Tory electoral triumph of 1710. The gentry reacted against the war itself and began demanding peace. In the new parliament St. John's private remarks were being reiterated by other Tories. During the debates on the Bewdley charter Sir John Pakington, the Tory member for Worcestershire, complained:

"If a gentleman speaks against the continuance of the war, to prevent the beggary of the nation, to prevent the moneyed and military men becoming lords of us who have the lands, then he is to be no object of her majesty's favour and encouragement I remember the time, when such restraints as these would not have been suffered or endured."⁷⁶

The Tories clearly saw a division between the landed interest and the moneyed interest and thought this was mirrored in the party divisions between Tories and Whigs. Even if this merely reflected unfounded prejudices it is not to be ignored. Party principles, in all ages, are as likely to be based on myths as on reality. In this case the Tories did act as if there existed this dichotomy between the landed

⁷⁵ Bodleian Library, Oxford. English Mss. Misc. E. 180 ff. 4-5.
Letter dated Bucklebury, 9 July 1709.

⁷⁶ William Cobbett's Parliamentary History, vi, 932.

gentry and the moneyed men, and, as we shall see, they had some grounds for so acting.⁷⁷ The Tories claimed that the country gentlemen voted for them, but on the other hand the Whigs had the electoral support of the financial classes. In 1710 Henry Weston reported to Lord Guernsey that he had remonstrated with a Mr. Oglethorpe for being against the Tory candidate in the Surrey election: "I told him that I thought he had more spirit and resentment than to suffer the City of London to choose the representatives for Surrey, that Sir R[ichard] O[nslow] had manifestly put his whole dependance on his City freinds, and despised the interest of the Country Gentlemen, that Mr. Finch would certainly make a breach in his interest."⁷⁸ It was on this kind of evidence of electoral behaviour that the Tories tried to restrict the qualifications for members of parliament to the ownership of property, as distinct from funds and bank stock. On 8 February 1703 a bill to this effect was passed by the Commons,⁷⁹ where there was a Tory majority, but was rejected by the Whig majority in the Lords.⁸⁰ Two years later the Tories brought in a bill

⁷⁷ See below, pp.101-108. Cf. Plumb's Political Stability, p. 138.

⁷⁸ Chatsworth House. Devonshire Mss. Finch papers, box 5, bundle 13. Letter dated Whitehall, 29 July 1710.

⁷⁹ Commons' Journals, xiv, 184.

⁸⁰ Lords' Debates, ii, 47-48. The vote here is given as 46 to 39, and there is also a list of twenty peers who signed a protest, believing it should have received further consideration. Of these, fourteen were Tories; they had all fourteen supported the Occasional Conformity bill in 1703. They were Abingdon, Carnarvon, Dartmouth, Denbigh, Lempster, Normanby, Nottingham, Plymouth, Poulett, Sandwich, Scarsdale, Stawell and Weymouth. Three of the peers generally supported the Court and cannot be given party labels; these were Barnard, Kent and Lindsey. Only three of the twenty peers were Whigs, viz., Cholmondely, Townshend and Warrington.

to restrict the office of justice of the peace to those who owned land or real estate worth £300 a year. It passed the Commons without a division but the Lords put off their second reading of the bill, and ignored all reminders from the Commons, so the measure fell through.⁸¹ After their electoral triumph of 1710 the Tories again brought in a bill to restrict the qualifications of M.P.s to those owning land or real estate worth at least six hundred pounds if they wished to represent a county and three hundred pounds in the case of a borough seat. The bill was prepared by four staunch Tories, Allen (or Peter) Bathurst, Ralph Freeman, Sir John Stonehouse and Sir John Walter.⁸² In the Commons there seems to have been no opposition and the bill passed on 16 February 1711.⁸³ Six days later the Lords passed it without any amendment.⁸⁴ Bishop Burnet was no doubt correct when he surmised that "the design of this was to exclude courtiers, military men, and merchants from sitting in the house of commons, in hopes that this being settled, the land interest would be the prevailing consideration in all their consultations."⁸⁵ The act was hailed by the Tory press.

81 H.M.C., House of Lords Mss., vi, p. xvii.

82 Commons' Journals, xvi, 432.

83 Ibid., xvi, 502.

84 Lords' Journals, xix, 233. The chairman of the committee to examine the bill was Lord Ferrers, a Tory, who had voted for Sacheverell in 1710. The eldest sons of peers and the university members were excluded from the operation of the act. Statutes of the Realm, ix, 9 Anne, c. 5.

85 Burnet, vi, 40.

Swift wrote: "The House of Commons have taken care in their first session, by that noble bill of qualification, that future Parliaments should be composed of landed men, and our properties be no more at the mercy of those who have none themselves, or at least what is only transient or imaginary."⁸⁶ Later he described the act "as the greatest security that was ever contrived for preserving the constitution, which otherwise might in a little time be wholly at the mercy of the moneyed interest."⁸⁷

The Tory country gentlemen were somewhat perplexed by the whole business of public credit, but they were convinced that there was a connection between the financial interests in the City and the Whig party. Nor were their suspicions without foundation. The Bank of England was, from its foundation, a predominantly Whig interest and the Tories failed to establish a rival Land Bank in 1696.⁸⁸ Though the old East India Company had been linked with the Tories, the united East India Company fell into Whig hands from the start.⁸⁹ In Anne's reign there is

⁸⁶ The Examiner, No. 31, 8 March 1711.

⁸⁷ Ibid., No. 45, 14 June 1711. Unfortunately the act was easily circumvented by lawyers arranging to convey fictitious qualifications for the duration of the election. Plumb's Political Stability, p. 143.

⁸⁸ Keith Feiling, A History of the Tory Party 1640-1714, hereafter cited as Feiling, (Oxford, 1924), p. 322, and Plumb's Political Stability, p. 138.

⁸⁹ Letters Illustrative of the Reign of William III from 1696 to 1708 addressed to the Duke of Shrewsbury by James Vernon, hereafter cited as Vernon Correspondence, ed. G.P.R. James (London, 1841), iii, 332, and H.M.C., Fortescue Mss., i, 30. E. Harrison to Thos. Pitt, Batavia, 25 July 1707.

ample evidence of the Whig domination of these financial companies. In the summer of 1710 Gilbert Heathcote and other directors of the Bank of England were so alarmed by the fall of the Whig earl of Sunderland that they sought the Queen's assurance that she did not intend further alterations in the Whig ministry.⁹⁰ The success of the Tories in the 1710 election produced a financial crisis, with which Robert Harley had to struggle for several months. In January 1711 Swift was writing to Stella: "Harley has the procuring of five or six millions on his shoulders, and the Whigs will not lend a groat; which is the only reason of the fall of stocks: for they are like quakers and fanaticks, that will only deal among themselves, while all others deal indifferently with them."⁹¹ Harley eventually managed to secure financial support for his administration from a few Tory financiers like Sir James Bateman, but this was only sufficient to tide him over the initial crisis and he sought a more permanent financial basis for the new ministry.⁹² In

90 Feiling, p. 419. Ann Clavering told James Clavering: "The Whiggs have been so brave and daring, all to lett know that no money was to be had, for they could not advance for the army when a Torry Ministry was to succeed, for all securitys then were nought, which alarm'd all and, by the help of present Councilours the head Whiggs of the Citty sent for, and assurance given from the Queen's own mouth of no further state." Durham University Library. Clavering papers. Letter dated London, 17 June 1710.

91 The Journal to Stella, ed. Harold Williams (Oxford, 1948), i. 163.

92 For Harley's efforts to combat these early financial difficulties, see The Calendar of Treasury Books, ed. W. A. Shaw, 1711, XXV, i, v-l1i; B. W. Hill, 'The Career of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, from 1702 to 1714', unpublished Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1961, pp. 177-211; and Abel Boyer, Quadriennium Annae Postremum; or The Political State of Great Britain, hereafter cited as Boyer's Political State (2nd ed.; London, 1718-19), i, 147.

April 1711 both the Whigs and the Tories circulated lists of recommended directors for election to the Bank of England and the East India Company. For the latter, nineteen Whigs were elected and only four Tories.⁹³ In the election for the Bank the entire list of twenty-four candidates supported by the Whigs was elected, though eleven of this list had also been on that of the Tories. In the election for governor and deputy-governor the Whig candidates, Nathaniel Gould and John Rudge, defeated Harley's nominees, Sir James Bateman and James Dolliffe.⁹⁴ When Harley established the South Sea Company in 1711 he deliberately made it a Tory preserve. Bateman and Samuel Ongley were appointed sub-governor and deputy-governor respectively, while all the directors were Tory merchants, Tory politicians or clients of Harley.⁹⁵ When Harley first introduced the South Sea Company bill, both the Bank and the East India Company fought to safeguard their vested interests, while the opposition in the Commons was led by the Whig, Robert Walpole.⁹⁶

The Tories' resentment of the Whig financial interests was exacerbated by the conviction that the long wars with France were ruining them while enriching the latter. The land tax, which at four shillings

93 Boyer's Political State, 1, 263-4.

94 The Daily Courant, 4-15 April 1711.

95 J. G. Sperling, 'The Division of 25 May 1711, on an amendment to the South Sea Bill: A note on the reality of parties in the age of Anne.' Historical Journal (1961), IV, 11, 195.

96 Ibid., p. 194.

in the pound was the principal tax, weighed particularly heavily on the lesser gentry, the typical Tory squire. The Tories regularly complained of this burden and one historian has even argued that "the land tax was, indeed, at the heart of the political battles under Queen Anne."⁹⁷ After their triumph in 1710 the Tories began demanding some alleviation of this burden. Lord Berkeley informed Lord Strafford: "They say ye country gentlemen will take it very ill if there is not at least two shil[lings] taken from the land, and some will have it yt ye whole four will be taken off, supplied by a lottery, or by taxing the funds."⁹⁸ Three months later, in April 1713, the campaign was crowned with success and Berkeley could report: "The house of commons hath pleas'd a great part of ye nation with taking two shillings off the land."⁹⁹ While the gentry groaned under the weight of the land tax the Tories witnessed the enrichment of the moneyed classes. This was not merely the result of prejudice for it does seem that in this period the opportunities for making large profits from trade, government contracting, and speculating in stocks and funds, multiplied, allowing the leading commercial and business families to rise to an entirely new level of wealth.¹⁰⁰

97 W. R. Ward, The English Land Tax in the Eighteenth Century (Oxford, 1953), p. 29.

98 B.M.Add.Ms. 22220, f. 50. Letter dated 7 Jan. 1712/13.

99 Ibid., f. 65. Letter dated 24 April 1713.

100 G. E. Mingay, English Landed Society in the Eighteenth Century (London, 1963), p. 29. The Whig financiers certainly supported the war long after the Tory squires had wearied of it. See The Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, ii, 391-2. Godolphin to Marlborough, 9 Sept. 1709.

The Tories, however, not only saw the Whig moneyed interests being enriched by legitimate business, but confidently believed that the Whigs were guilty of misappropriating government money. It was this conviction that provoked many factious attacks on the Whigs throughout the reign. After the 1702 election the Tory majority appointed commissioners of accounts to investigate the last Whig ministry of William III. Their investigations led to the earl of Ranelagh being arraigned for malversation of government money and the earl of Halifax himself only escaped censure by the prior exoneration of the House of Lords.¹⁰¹ These attacks lapsed during the period of Whig dominance, but after the 1710 election the Tories again resurrected such accusations, this time against the late Whig ministry. The Tory members of the October Club demanded an inquiry into the abuses of the previous administration and one of their leaders, Henry Campion, argued:

"The only thing that was left to this honest parliament, was to inquire into these mismanagements, and certify them as far as possible, and punish the offenders to the terror of others. That this was the thing which was promised to be done, when they solicited the Elections; and to return to the Countrey without doing any such thing, would be an evidence to the Countrey, that they either had been imposed upon when such stories were told them, or that the new had succeeded the old in their integrity, as well as their places. That it was true an honourable member (meaning Mr. Harley) had been pleased to let them into a discovery he had made of some abuses in the victualling office, which regarded a member of the house (one Mr. Rudge a brewer of Portsmouth),

¹⁰¹ Commons' Journals, xiv, 171, 188-190 and Lords' Journals, xvii, 270-71. For examples of Tory attacks on corrupt Whigs in William III's reign, see Plumb's Political Stability, pp. 138-39.

but that tho' that was indeed an abuse as great as fell to the share of a Commoner, yet there were certainly other abuses which might be made out of some great men in the late Ministry, whereby it would appear the public had been cheated in Millions."¹⁰²

The language of Edward Repington, in a letter to the Tory Lord Weymouth, betrayed an even more intemperate and factious spirit:

"We were in hopes that the exorbitant Grants of K — W — m, conferred on Dutchmen, rigid fanatics, and the Sporus's of the Court, woud have been resumed and those people oblig'd to refund, who had for long prey'd upon the vitals of the Public. If these two points had been rightly manag'd, (as I hope it is not yet too late) we had been in a great measure eas'd of those heavy Impositions, which must end in the inevitable ruine of all People of narrow Fortunes. None woud have suffer'd but ill men which would have been a preservation of Persons of more honesty and better Principles."¹⁰³

With these attitudes prevalent among the Tory majority in the Commons it was easy for the ministry to censure the duke of Marlborough and to expell Robert Walpole from the Commons on charges of misusing public money. By appealing to Tory prejudices the ministers could seek to destroy the reputation of those who were in favour of continuing the war.

iv.

Differing attitudes towards the war with France were not merely a product of war-weariness. They were a source of party conflict

¹⁰² Auchmar House, Drymen, Stirlingshire. Montrose Mss. Mungo Graham to the duke of Montrose, 6 Feb. 1711.

¹⁰³ Longleat House. Thynne Papers, vol. xxvi, f. 97. Letter dated 10 Feb. 1710 [/11.].

throughout the reign of Queen Anne. In the late 1690s the Tories had criticised the diplomacy of William III, fearing that it would lead to an involvement in European affairs. They eventually impeached the King's Whig ministers for their part in negotiating the Partition treaties. Yet once Louis XIV recognised the Pretender, on the death of James II in 1701, the Tories joined with the Whigs in advocating a war against France.¹⁰⁴ But their agreement ended. Within weeks of the declaration of war the Tory earl of Rochester opposed Marlborough's whole strategy. In a meeting of the Privy Council on 2 May 1702 Rochester urged that England should only take part in the war as an auxiliary, but he was overruled.¹⁰⁵ The earl of Nottingham, the Tory secretary of state, had a somewhat different view on how England should wage the war. He wished to follow the traditional Tory policy of a naval war, which offered a safe, profitable and limited strategy. By April 1703 he was confessing to Heinsius, the Dutch grand pensionary: "I have long been of opinion that no Warr can be of great damage to France, but that which is prosecuted ... by a Fleet, and an Army accompanying it, I think the reasons for this assertion are so plain, that I need not mention them, and the last War is an unhappy instance of the truth of it."¹⁰⁶ The Tories supported a naval war,

104 Feiling, p. 353. For the changing Tory attitude to the war see Douglas Coombs, The Conduct of the Dutch (The Hague, 1958) passim.

105 William Coxe, Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough (2nd ed.; London, 1820), 1, 152.

106 Northants Record Office. Finch-Hatton Mss., vol. 277, p. 1. Letter dated 30 April 1703.

hoping it would result in profitable gains both in trade and colonies while allowing a reduction in the land tax. The Whigs, besides making profits from contracts from and loans to the government, genuinely believed that only England's involvement in the continental war could ensure the defeat of Louis XIV's attempts to dominate all Europe.

Throughout the reign there were political disputes illustrating the differences between the Whig and Tory strategy for the conduct of the war. On the one hand the Tories supported the admiralty and the naval war, while the Whigs were quick to criticise either of these. The Tories praised the success of the navy at Vigo in 1702 and even after Blenheim the Tory majority in the Commons included Admiral Rooke's drawn battle of Malaga in their address of congratulations to the Queen.¹⁰⁷ In 1703 the Commons avoided an inquiry into the fleet, but the Whig majority in the Lords carried out an investigation and found fault with the admiralty's orders, chiefly with sending Shovell to the Mediterranean and Graydon to the West Indies.¹⁰⁸ Four years later the Whigs launched an attack on the admiralty, seeking to replace the Tory admiral, George Churchill, with their own candidate, Lord Orford. On 12 November 1707 Lord Wharton, seconded by Somers, led the attack. A week later the Whig Junto presented petitions from 154 merchants demanding better naval protection. The Tory peers supported the Junto,

¹⁰⁷ Richard Chandler, The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons, hereafter cited as Commons' Debates, (London, 1742), 111, 393.

¹⁰⁸ Burnet, v, 110.

but really sought to turn the occasion into an attack on the ministry as a whole. When the Whigs drew off the admiralty was saved.¹⁰⁹ In February 1708, however, the Whigs moved an address to the Queen, that "there cannot be a plainer proof that some persons employed by the Lord High Admiral have made the worst use imaginable of the Trust he honours them with."¹¹⁰ The Junto continued to press for changes, and were finally successful after the death of Prince George had weakened the Queen's resistance. The moderate Lord Pembroke moved to the Admiralty, but within a year he was replaced by Lord Orford, one of the Whig Junto.

In contrast the Tories saw that the Whigs supported a land war and consequently the army officers were pro-Whig. After the failure of the Tack and other Tory measures of the 1704-5 parliamentary session a dispirited Tory grumbled sourly: "I wish a Bill was brought in to make officers, as well Members of Parl[iamen]t as others, to be with their men and not to be suffered to loyter in Eng[lan]d when the campaign is begun."¹¹¹ Major Cranstoun admitted the general satisfaction felt in the army at the prospect of the Whig, John Smith, becoming Speaker in 1705: "Most of our army here are Whigs and staunch ones, and so are very glad to hear that the Court have now for the first time declared

109 W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-1714: A Study in Political Organisation', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1965), pp. 159-161.

110 Lords' Journals, xviii, 483.

111 Buckinghamshire Record Office. Verney Mss. Lord Fermanagh to Thomas Cave, 4 Feb. 1704/5.

themselves so much above-board as that of the Lord Treasurer's recommending Mr. Smith for Speaker seems to be."¹¹² With Marlborough more and more dependent upon Whig support for his concept of the war it was not surprising that he felt constrained to promote Whig officers. In 1710 Lord Orrery warned Harley of the dangers inherent in this practice:

"Some time ago I writ to H. St. J[ohn] pretty earnestly to let him know how necessary I thought it was that some restraint should be put to that exorbitant power Lord Marlborough has in the army. I am every day more convinced of that necessity, for he plainly disposes of preferments here with no other view but to create a faction sufficient to support him against the Queen and her friends in case every other prop should fail."¹¹³

When the Tory ministers wished to end the war they had to begin a policy of weeding out the Whig army officers. In 1712 Marlborough and Erle were removed; in 1713 Cadogan and Portland were dismissed. When the conclusion of peace still did not end the army's opposition to the government the ministers dismissed Argyll, Stair, Major-General Davenport and others in 1714.¹¹⁴ During the war itself the Whig

112 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 250. To Robert Cunningham, Camp at Herenthals, 1 Oct. 1705. After the Tories' success in the 1710 election Sir John Pakington "was glad to see the face of a British Parliament, the former one looking like military ones." Ann Clavering to James Clavering, London, 21 Dec. 1710. Durham University Library. Clavering Papers.

113 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 554. Letter dated Camp before Bethune, 31 July 1710. In 1711 Marlborough was forbidden to make promotions in the field and the sale of all commissions had to be sanctioned by the crown.

114 Boyer's Political State, iii, 62, 386; iv, 37; vi, 57; vii, 264.

strategy had prevailed, but this did not prevent the Tories making party capital out of the failure in Spain. In two major debates on Spain, in 1707-8 and 1710-11, the Tories criticised this weakness in the Whig strategy, the failure to wrest the Spanish throne from the Bourbons.¹¹⁵

After Blenheim the war strategy of Marlborough and the Whigs had prevailed against Tory opposition. While the war continued successfully the Tories lost ground. By 1709, however, the war was both expensive and unsuccessful, and when the peace negotiations of that year foundered the Tory stock rose again. In the summer of 1709 Henry St. John declared to his crony, James Brydges, that: "Peace is at this time the most desirable publick or private Good. If you will not think yt I putt on too much of the Country Esq^r I'll Venture to tell you, that wee want it more then perhaps any man out of the country can Imagine."¹¹⁶ When the Tories returned to power in 1710 they did so as a party dedicated to negotiating a peace. The result was a fierce party conflict with the Whigs, which lasted even beyond the conclusion of peace in 1713. Dozens of party pamphlets were published by both sides, but the most celebrated and most successful was Swift's

115 See H. T. Dickinson, 'British Military and Naval operations in Catalonia and Valencia 1705-10', unpublished Durham M.A. thesis (1963), pp. 221-248.

116 'Letters of Henry St. John to James Brydges', ed. Godfrey Davies and Marion Tinling. Huntington Library Bulletin (Oct. 1935), no. 8, p. 161. Letter dated Bucklebury, 26 June 1709.

The Conduct of the Allies. This work put forward all the Tory objections to the Whig conduct of the war. It argued that despite the failure of the allies to play a part in the war, commensurate with their interests and their treaty obligations, the aims of the Grand Alliance had been achieved long ago. The war was merely being prolonged to enrich the Whigs in general and Marlborough in particular: "With these Measures fell in all that Sett of People, who are called the Monied Men; such as had raised vast Sums by Trading with Stocks and Funds, and Lending upon great Interest and Praemiums; whose perpetual Harvest is War, and whose beneficial way of Traffick must very much decline by a Peace..... The Whigs were received into Employments, left to manage the Parliament, cry down the Landed Interest, and worry the Church."¹¹⁷ In this pamphlet Swift was arousing all the Tory prejudices into a violent onslaught on the war; an onslaught to which the Whigs had no effective counter-blast. The decision of the Tory earl of Nottingham to support the opposition's motion of 'no peace without Spain' in December 1711 does not really invalidate the argument that the parties differed in principle over the war. The earl himself was disgruntled at not being given office, he had secured Whig support for an Occasional Conformity bill, and he was probably sincere in his opposition to any peace which did not secure Spain. Yet he could not carry a large section of the Tory party against the peace. Of his own personal

¹¹⁷ Swift's Prose Works, vi, 41-2.

adherents only his son joined him in opposing the peace preliminaries. Among the one hundred and eight opponents of these terms in the Commons on 7 December 1711, only eleven could be classified as Tories. It has been shown that only Lord Finch of these eleven remained a firm Tory. The other ten continued to vote with the Whigs on other issues than the peace, and may be regarded as the first Hanoverian Tories.¹¹⁸ The overwhelming majority of the Tory party was in favour of the peace, while none of the Whigs appeared to support it.

V.

While the Tory party's devotion to extreme monarchical principles never fully recovered after the Revolution and remained relatively muted under Anne, it is clear that the Tories did hold well defined principles which were opposed to those of the Whigs. Of these the most important was the Tory party's devotion to the Anglican Church. However, we have also seen that there was also a political conflict between the Tories, as representatives of the landed interest, and the Whigs, who were predominant among the moneyed interests. During the reign of Anne, at least, there was a sharp divergence of opinion between

118 G. S. Holmes, 'The Commons' division on 'No peace without Spain', 7 December 1711'. Bull.Inst.Hist.Res. (1960), xxxiii, 227-228. The eleven Tory defectors were: John Aislaby, Sir Edmund Bacon, John Bromley, Henry Cromwell, George Downing, George England, Joseph Erle, Richard Farrington, Lord Finch, Thomas Pitt, and Thomas Webb.

the Whigs and the Tories as to the conduct of the war and the proper terms to be negotiated at a peace settlement. There is also overwhelming evidence that the Tories and the Whigs were almost diametrically opposed on minor issues such as their attitude towards foreigners. A study,¹¹⁹ based mainly on the divergent views expressed on the desirability of the naturalization of aliens, shows the Tories to be far more insular and chauvinistic than the Whigs.

The English attitude towards foreigners could have been influenced by several factors. Commercial rivalry might have accounted for some of the hostility felt for the French and Dutch. Other motives could have been the religious antipathy towards both papists and protestant Dissenters, and the political animosity towards both French absolutism or Dutch republicanism. Among the less sophisticated there was then, as always, a certain distrust and even dislike of the foreigner per se. Moreover the average squire, who made up the bulk of the political nation, was inordinately proud of all things English, especially the Church, the monarchy, and what were generally regarded as

119 The following section is to be published as 'The Tory party's attitude to foreigners: a note on party principles in the age of Anne' in Bull.Inst.Hist.Res. in Nov. 1967. Cf. Plumb's Political Stability, pp. 132 n. and 153 n.; "It is, however, my contention that party strife goes deeper than a few great public issues and that it was symptomatic of deep divisions in the political nation and indeed reflected two bitterly opposing attitudes not only to the nature of political power but also to its social function"; and "Xenophobia was a very strong concomitant of Toryism."

English liberties. Joseph Addison, the Whig pamphleteer, caricatured the Tory squire and in The Freeholder put these words into the mouth of a Tory backwoodsman: "'But is it not strange that we should be making war upon church of England men, with Dutch and Swiss soldiers, men of antimonarchical principles? These foreigners will never be loved in England, Sir; they have not that wit and good breeding that we have'.... He then declared, frankly, that he had always been against all treaties and alliance with foreigners."¹²⁰ As the reign of Queen Anne was dominated by the war of Spanish succession, there is ample evidence of England's relations with most of the countries of western Europe. From this it is possible to discover the different attitudes adopted by the political parties. The Whigs were opposed to almost all things French and when they opposed Bolingbroke's proposal for a commercial treaty with France in 1713, they were joined by a body of Tories led by Sir Thomas Hanmer. Though economic considerations played a large part in inspiring this defection, it seems likely that there was a residual dislike of closer relations with France in any form. Though this must remain conjecture a more solid case can be made out for the difference in the Whig and Tory attitudes towards the allies. Both Swift's The Conduct of the Allies and Bolingbroke's correspondence¹²¹ reveal a strong Tory

¹²⁰ The Freeholder, no. 22 (Monday, 5 March 1716).

¹²¹ See, for example, St. John to Lord Orrery, Whitehall, 24 July 1711 in Bodleian Library, Ms. Eng. Letters, e. 4, f. 53 and St. John to James Dayrolle, 2 Aug. 1711 in B.M.Add.Ms. 15866, f. 222.

dislike of the Austrians; but much more illuminating were the opinions that the two parties held of the Dutch. The whole question of the English attitude towards the Dutch has been treated in detail by Douglas Coombs,¹²² but what is particularly interesting, in the context here, is that a man's opinion of the Dutch tended to show his political leanings. Whereas a Whig ministry negotiated the Barrier treaty with the Dutch, a Tory government roundly condemned it. Swift, when inclined towards the moderate Whigs in his early career, wrote as a friend and admirer of the Dutch, but when he was patronised by the Tory leaders he poured scorn on the Dutch in The Conduct of the Allies and Remarks on the Barrier Treaty.¹²³ The Whig earl of Shaftesbury delineated this party division more forcibly: "There is no need I should tell you that in all our Nation the only Lovers of Holland are the Lovers of Liberty called Whigs. The contrary Party (the Tories) are inveterate & I remember a saying of one of the best and wisest of our latter Patriots, who used often to give it for a Rule; if you would discover a concealed Tory, Jacobite or Papist, speak but of the Dutch and you will find him out by his passionate Railing."¹²⁴

The Tories' hostility to foreigners coloured their attitude towards the whole question of the protestant succession. William III

122 The Conduct of the Dutch, passim.

123 For this transformation, see, J. Kent Clark, 'Swift and the Dutch', Huntington Library Quarterly (1953-4), xvii, 345-356.

124 P.R.O. Shaftesbury papers, 30/24/22/2. To Mons. Van Twedde, St. Giles, 17 Jan. 1705/6.

had never been popular with the Tories, who resented his Dutch favourites and attacked him for involving England in a Dutch war.¹²⁵ The Act of Settlement of 1701 incorporated several clauses meant to restrict foreign influence on the sovereign. They served as an indictment of William III and as a safeguard against similar conduct by the Hanoverians. Francis Atterbury, the high church Tory, later acknowledged that "that which is of the greatest moment to the kingdom, and most for the safety of the king, is that part of the act that excludes all foreigners from any employments, or grants of land, &c. in these nations; which takes off the king the odium of giving up the rights of Englishmen to outlandish craving cormorants, and also may satisfy the people, that his majesty's affections are not settled upon aliens and strangers."¹²⁶ Though the death of William III was lamented by the Whigs, it was welcomed by the Tories, and not only for narrow party advantage. The Tory Sir John Verney was informed: "I am assured of one thing, yt no King can be less lamented than this has bin ye very day he died, there was sevrall expressions of Joy, publickley spok in ye streets, of having one of their own nation to rain over them, & yt now ye should not have their money caried beyon say [sea] to enrich other nations, but it would be spent amonx them."¹²⁷ Queen Anne's accession was doubly popular with

125 Feiling, p. 304.

126 Francis Atterbury, 'English Advice to the Freeholders of England' (London, 1714) in Somers' Tracts, ed. Sir Walter Scott (London, 1815), xiii, 557.

127 Buckinghamshire Record Office. Verney Mss. Elizabeth Adams to Sir John Verney, 21 Mar. 1701/2.

the Tories because of her nationality. The earl of Nottingham was told: "There never was such an opportunity to save this nation as now, for all the best party are so transported to have an English Queen that they will agree to all that is for her and her Kingdom's interest."¹²⁸ In her first speech to parliament the Queen herself proudly declared: "I know mine own Heart to be entirely English."¹²⁹ The reluctance of the Tories to face up to the Hanoverian succession was not only because of lingering Jacobitism, but because of their dislike of being ruled by a German prince. When, in September 1713, the Queen recovered from an illness, a Tory wrote to Dr. Charlett, the high church president of University College, Oxford: "I rejoice to hear, that the Queen recovers her strength, for I dread the thoughts of a foreign sovereign."¹³⁰ Though the Pretender's religion was a stumbling block to his succession, his English birth was a distinct advantage. In July 1714 the earl of Oxford (Robert Harley) observed to Gaultier, the French agent: "Le Prince qui veut succeder à la Reyne Anne aura toujours un grand avantage étant né en Angleterre, sur son compétiteur, car les bons Anglois ne s'accorderont jamais d'un Prince Allemand."¹³¹

The attitude of the parties to foreigners in general can best be illustrated by a study of their opinions on the subject of naturalizing

¹²⁸ Cited by Feiling, p. 363. Anonymous letter dated 10 Mar. 1702.

¹²⁹ Commons' Debates, iii, 199.

¹³⁰ Bodleian Library, Oxford. Ballard Ms. 15, f. 107. Jo Johnson to Charlett, Cranbrook, 5 Sept. 1713. Johnson went on to describe how he had been opposing 'the Whiggish interest' in the recent election.

¹³¹ L. G. Wickham Legg, 'Extracts from Jacobite Correspondence 1712-1714'. E.H.R. (1915), xxx, 508.

aliens of any nationality. Foreign immigrants, especially from the Low Countries, had been coming into England for centuries. Many had sought to be naturalized, either singly or in fairly large groups, by individual acts of parliament. In the reign of Queen Anne there were many of these special naturalization acts. These provoked little opposition or even comment, but any attempt to pass a more general naturalization act, produced a party division on Whig and Tory lines. On 1 March 1704 the Lords, where at this time there was a Whig majority, resolved to order the judges to bring in a bill for "naturalizing all the Protestant Subjects of the Principality of Orange, who have departed their Country upon the Account of their Religion, who are, or shall, come and settle in this Kingdom."¹³² By 14 March the bill had passed through the House and it was sent to the Commons for their concurrence.¹³³ The Tory majority in the Commons quietly allowed the measure to drop, although, on 27 March, the Lords sent a message to remind that House of the bill.¹³⁴ The next significant naturalization bill was that for the benefit of Jacob Pechels and others. On 14 February 1705 the Tory dominated House of Commons, besides adding other names, inserted a clause, which prevented any person named in the bill, "who was not a natural born subject of the kingdom of England or whose parents or parent were, or was, not born in England or in the

¹³² Lords' Journals, xvii, 465.

¹³³ Ibid., xvii, 480.

¹³⁴ Ibid., xvii, 535.

territories thereunto belonging, from voting for any member to serve in Parliament."¹³⁵ This was a tacit acknowledgment that both Dissenters and naturalized foreigners were more likely to vote Whig than Tory.¹³⁶ The Lords refused to accept this clause.¹³⁷ The peers argued that every encouragement should be given to increase the number of inhabitants and to bring new and useful manufactures into England. Moreover it would be an infringement of their liberties to prevent naturalized men of property enjoying the same rights and privileges as native inhabitants.¹³⁸ A conference was called and the choice of managers reflected the party majority then prevailing in the two chambers.¹³⁹ With many Tackers among the Commons' managers and Junto

135 Commons' Journals, xiv, 528.

136 Cf. Atterbury's view: "I scarce ever knew a foreigner settled in England, whether of Dutch, French, Italian or Turkish growth, but became a Whig in a little time after mixing with us." Somers Tracts, xiii, 537.

137 Lords' Journals, xvii, 684-5.

138 Ibid., xvii, 697-8 and Commons' Journals, xiv, 575-576.

139 The managers for the Commons, listed in Commons' Journals, xiv, 575, were [John] Aislaby, Sir Geo. Beaumont, [William] Bromley, [member for Oxford University], [James] Bulteel, Colonel [Robert] Byerley, Mr. chancellor of the exchequer [Henry Boyle], Sir Gilbert Dolben, Sir Wm. Drake, Earl Dysert, [William] Ettrick, [Thomas] Fagg, [Ralph] Freeman, [Thomas] Gery, [James, or his son Henry] Grahme, [Francis] Gwyn, Sir Tho. Hanmer, Simon Harcourt, [John] Harpur, [John Grubham?] How, Sir Hu[mphrey] Mackworth, Sir Thomas Meers, [William] Pole, [Henry] Portman, [Francis] Scobell, Colonel [James] Stanhope, Sir Joseph Tredenham, and Sir Cha. Turner. When the voting record of these twenty-seven members is examined, using the ten extant voting lists, only three emerge as Whigs, viz., Boyle, Stanhope and Turner. Three others had mixed records and should be regarded as of doubtful party allegiance, viz., Aislaby, Fagg, and How. The remaining twenty-one were all Tories, and indeed eleven of them were Tackers. The managers for the Lords are listed in

Whigs among the peers, it was not surprising that the conference proved abortive; the Commons insisting on their clause.¹⁴⁰ The prorogation of parliament prevented any further consultation and the bill was lost. In the following session a motion was made in the Commons, on the report stage of a bill to naturalize Vincent Laymerie and others, to insert a similar clause, but this was defeated by 86 to 65 votes.¹⁴¹ It should be remembered, however, that in the interval between these two bills a general election had increased the Whig strength in the Commons. The new House was less afraid of naturalized aliens voting Whig.

The general election of 1708 produced the only sound Whig majority of the reign. On 5 February 1709 the Hon. Sidney Wortley Montagu, Whig member for Peterborough, moved for a bill for the general naturalization of foreign protestants. Henry Campion expressed the Tory hope "that if such a bill were brought in, there should be a clause

Lords' Journals, xvii, 685, as [Gilbert Burnet], bishop of Salisbury, Bolton, Halifax, Herbert, Mohun, Poulett, Somerset, Stamford, Sunderland, Torrington, Townshend, and Wharton. Apart from Poulett this is a solid group of Whigs and it includes many of the party's leading peers. Nine of them voted Sacheverell guilty in 1710, and the two exceptions, Somerset and Torrington, both opposed the Occasional Conformity bill in 1703 and the Schism Act in 1714.

¹⁴⁰ Commons' Journals, xiv, 577-8.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., xv, 174. 25 Feb. 1706. The tellers for the minority were two Tackers, Sir Christopher Hales and Henry Pinnell, and those for the majority were two Whigs, Lord William Pawlett and Richard Woollaston.

inserted in it for obliging such foreigners, as should be willing to enjoy the benefits of it, to receive the sacrament according to the usage of the Church of England."¹⁴² While the bill was depending a paper was printed and industriously dispersed, casting doubt on the wisdom of a General Naturalization act. It reiterated the Tory stand-point that foreign immigrants would endanger the peace of the kingdom and the security of the Anglican Church. The aliens could, by being naturalized, claim the same privileges as natural-born subjects. If they owned property, they would therefore have the right to vote and the ability to threaten the existing constitution. If they were poor, they would prove a burden on the nation and further impoverish the poorer native inhabitants. By frequent inter-marriage they could help extinguish the English race.¹⁴³ When, on 14 February, the bill was presented to the House¹⁴⁴ and passed its first reading, it confirmed the Tory fears of its contents. The preamble argued that "the Increase of People is a Means of advancing the Wealth and Strength of a Nation." Providing the foreign protestants took the necessary oaths

¹⁴² Commons' Debates, iv, 113. The bill had already been discussed in the newspapers. Charles Leslie, the Tory non-juror, fulminated against the hordes, who would overwhelm the Church of England. See The Rehearsal, iv, nos. 25, 26, 31, 32 and 33 (for 5, 8, 26, 29 Jan. and 9 Feb. 1709). Defoe replied in The Review, v, nos. 124 and 127 (11 and 18 Jan. 1709).

¹⁴³ Commons' Debates, iv, 119-121.

¹⁴⁴ Commons' Journals, xvi, 108.

and declaration, they could be naturalized for a fee of only one shilling. The sacrament could be taken in any 'Protestant or reformed Congregation'; a sore point with the Tory opposition.¹⁴⁵ The city of London protested that the bill would deprive them of duties paid by merchants to the City, but the petition was rejected.¹⁴⁶ When the bill was ordered to be engrossed, the Tories offered a clause that naturalized foreigners "shall be obliged to receive the Sacrament in the Church of England and take Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy but this was carryed in the negative upon a division yeas 160: noes 189 and now they are all allowed to receive the same in any Protestant Church or meeting houses, qualifying themselves otherwise as the Law Requires."¹⁴⁷ A further amendment, to the effect that no naturalized person could be elected to the Commons, was defeated by 168 to 67 votes.¹⁴⁸ The Tory resistance was crumbling: "'Twas thought the act of General

145 7 Anne c. 5. Statutes of the Realm (London, 1963), ix, 63.

146 Commons' Journals, xvi, 123.

147 B.M. Portland (Harley papers). Loan 29/320. Dyer's newsletter, London, 3 Mar. 1708/9.

148 Commons' Journals, xvi, 143. The tellers for the minority were two Tories, Henry Campion and Lewis (or possibly John) Price, and those for the majority were Whigs, namely Sidney Wortley Montagu and William Thompson. The Tory fear, expressed in this amendment, was probably justified. There were twenty-eight M.P.s during the reign of Anne, who could be identified as Dissenters or supporters of the Dissenters' cause. See, P. M. Scholes, 'Parliament and the Protestant Dissenters 1702-1719', unpublished London M.A. thesis (1962), app. i, pp. 166-171. In all they cast ninety-seven Whig votes and not a single Tory vote on the ten extant voting lists.

Naturalization would have met with great opposition in the house

but it passed with hardly any at all."¹⁴⁹ In fact the bill passed its

third reading on 7 March 1709 by the large majority of 203 to 77

votes.¹⁵⁰

149 B.M.Add.Ms. 31143, ff. 312-313. Peter Wentworth to Lord Raby, 18 Mar. 1708/9.

150 Commons' Journals, xvi, 143. The tellers for the majority were two Whigs, Lord William Pawlett and William Strickland, and those for the minority were two Tories, Sir Thomas Hanmer and Arthur or Francis Annesley. There is no extant division list on this bill but there are three examples of a list purporting to show who voted for the bill. These are, A List of those Members of the late Parliament, that voted for the passing of the Act for Naturalizing Foreign Protestants; and consequently, for the bringing over the Palatines, a printed broadsheet, without date, but probably 1710; A View of the Queen and Kingdom's Enemies in the case of the Poor Palatines (London, 1709), pp. 11-16; and Considerations concerning the expediency of a General Naturalization of Foreign Protestants (London, 1747), pp. 21-28. These three lists correlate exactly, except that in the last the names of Francis Foot and John Burridge are missing. However, where they should be listed there are unusual blank spaces, so presumably it was merely a printer's error. It should also be pointed out that '.... Carey, M.P. for Haslemere' is, in fact, Sir Nicholas Carew. Altogether there are 249 M.P.s on this list, a number which does not correspond with any known vote on this bill. It is, therefore, probably only a compilation of those M.P.s, who were known to sympathise with the bill. As such it shows that the compilers regarded the Whigs as the chief supporters of the bill. When the voting behaviour of these 249 members is analysed against the other nine known lists, the result is illuminating. Between them these members cast 725 votes in this reign, of which a mere eight were on the Tory side. This gives a Whig percentage of over ninety-eight per cent. Only seven members cast any Tory votes. Four of these were placemen, viz., James Brydges (paymaster general of the forces abroad), Thomas Coke (vice-chamberlain), William Lowndes (secretary to the Treasury), and Henry Vincent jnr., (commissioner of victualling when he voted Tory in 1713). The other three, John Borlace, Craven Peyton, and Russell Robartes, all voted Tory in 1713 on the Commercial Treaty with France, though some versions of this list do not have Robartes voting Tory then. Of the whole seven only Coke had voted Tory before 1709.

In the Lords the bill was supported by the Whig majority, who rushed it through in one day. On 15 March it was passed, with nine Tory peers dissenting "because we humbly conceive that this Bill of General Naturalization will be very prejudiciall to the Trade and Manufactures of this Nation, and may be of ill Consequence to our Liberties and Religion."¹⁵¹ In the committee of the whole House the petition from the city of London was again rejected. In the debate Gilbert Burnet, bishop of Salisbury, spoke strongly in favour of the bill, whilst the bishop of Chester, "who seemed resolved to distinguish himself as a zealot for that which was called the High Church", spoke as zealously against it.¹⁵² The Tories again failed to secure an amendment to the effect that the foreigners seeking naturalization must qualify themselves by taking the sacrament in an Anglican Church.¹⁵³

151 Lords' Journals, xviii, 667-8. The dissenting peers were Anglesey, Buckingham, Guernsey, Guilford, North and Grey, Nottingham, Scarsdale, Thanet, and the bishop of Winchester. They were all Tories. In 1710 they all voted Sacheverell not guilty, except the bishop, who did not record a vote on the issue. However he supported the Occasional Conformity bill of 1703 and, when bishop of Bristol, he had been one of the famous 'Seven Bishops'. For Nottingham's arguments against the act see his letter to William Bromley, 20 Dec. 1708. Leicester Record Office. Finch Mss., box vi, bundle 23.

152 Burnet, v, 399. Against this section Swift added the comment Dog.

153 H.M.C., House of Lords Mss., n.s., viii, 286. The voting on this amendment was 45 to 15 votes. The tellers were the Whig earl of Scarborough for the majority and the Tory earl of Abingdon for the minority. Sharp, archbishop of York, Dawes, bishop of Chester and Nicolson, bishop of Carlisle, were among the minority. Thomas Sharp, The Life of John Sharp, Lord Archbishop of York (London, 1825), i, 369. Sharp and Dawes were well-known high Church Tories and both voted for Dr. Sacheverell in 1710. Nicolson, though a Whig on secular matters, was high church on religious affairs. He supported both the Occasional Conformity bill and the Schism Act, and in 1718 opposed the repeal of both.

The bill duly passed its third reading with only the Tory earl of Abingdon registering a protest.¹⁵⁴

Within weeks of the passing of the General Naturalization Act thousands of poor Palatines began to enter the country, and the flood continued unabated throughout the summer of 1709. The Tories claimed that the chronic problem, which this large and sudden immigration caused, was a natural consequence of the act. When the Queen issued a brief to collect funds for the Palatines the two parties responded differently. Whereas the Whigs gave generously, the Tories opposed this charitable scheme. The duchess of Marlborough subscribed a thousand pounds and the duchess of Somerset five hundred,¹⁵⁵ but Sir Charles Duncomb, the Tory lord mayor of London, sent a mere fifty pounds "and would have scarce have done that but for the sake of his office, tho' he was worth Ten times as much as those that gave more."¹⁵⁶ Bishop Nicolson of Carlisle explicitly revealed the party issue behind the brief when he confessed ironically to Bishop Wake: "If large contributions on this occasion be ye true distinguishing character of Whigs, we shall assuredly pass for rank Tories."¹⁵⁷ The Tories also

154 Lords' Journals, xvii, 668. Narcissus Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs, hereafter cited as Luttrell, (Oxford, 1857), vi, 418, gives the division as 65 to 20 votes.

155 Algemeen Rijksarchief, The Hague. Letters from L'Hermitage to Heinsius, hereafter cited as Heinsius Mss., inventory no. 1441, letters dated 5 and 12 Aug., n.s. 1709.

156 A View of the Queen and Kingdom's Enemies in the Case of the Poor Palatines, p. 6. Duncomb was reputed to be the richest commoner in England.

157 Christ Church Library, Oxford. Wake Mss. Arch. W. Epist. vol. 17, f. 233. Letter dated Rose, 13 Oct. 1709.

conducted a propaganda campaign to convince the nation that the Palatines should never have been allowed into the country. In a pamphlet of 1709 an English tradesman was made to say: "I think our Charity ought to begin at Home, both in Peace and War, before we extend it to our Neighbours..... The Palatines may be Poor enough, but their coming hither can never make us Rich."¹⁵⁸ White Kennett charged the Tories with deliberately fomenting opposition to the Palatines: "The prejudices against them have been artfully improv'd and specially among one party of men, and the like humour no doubt will obstruct the Charity in most country places."¹⁵⁹ According to L'Hermitage, the Dutch agent, the London mob was incited by Jacobites and papists to attack the Palatines, who were forced to put an armed guard on their camps.¹⁶⁰ Certainly the Whig ministry had considerable difficulty in settling the Palatines in England amidst such evident hostility. Some thousands returned home, while seven thousand went to Ireland, New York, and the West Indies.¹⁶¹

Though most of the Palatines eventually left the country the Tory party's attitude to foreigners in general, and to the unfortunate Palatines in particular, did not abate. In 1710 the Tories used it as an election issue. The Tory candidates for the city of London declared:

158 The Palatines' Catechism (London, 1709), p. 4.

159 B.M. Lansdowne Ms. 1013, f. 127. To Rev Samuel Blackwell, 8 Oct. 1709.

160 Heinsius Mss., 1441. To Heinsius, 15/26 July and 2/13 Aug. 1709.

161 For a detailed study of the settlement of, and political reaction to, the Palatines see my article, 'The Poor Palatines and the Parties', E.H.R., (1967), lxxi, pp.464-485.

We "are for cultivating a good understand with our Protestant neighbours, without complimenting away our commerce, or inviting them to intermeddle in affairs of our government or to send over the scum of their countries to make ourselves, who already abound in poor, yet poorer."¹⁶² The duke of Marlborough's Whig chaplain, Francis Hare, defended the principle of welcoming foreigners to England. He reiterated the standard Whig argument, that "it is a Fundamental Maxim in Sound Politicks, that the Greatness, Wealth, and Strength, of a Country, consist in the Number of its Inhabitants."¹⁶³ After their success in the 1710 general election the Tory gentry, particularly among the October Club, resolved to repeal the General Naturalization act. The bill, presented by Finch, Campion and Lowndes, easily passed the Commons on 31 January 1711, apparently without a division.¹⁶⁴ In the Lords the Whigs still had a majority and the Court was divided on the wisdom of this measure. Shrewsbury, Argyll and Queensberry, supporters of the ministry but with Whiggish principles, did not attend the House when the bill was debated. Robert Harley, who was well-known for his sympathy with the nonconformists, left the chamber before the vote was taken. Three Scottish peers,

162 The Supplement 9 Oct. 1710. Quoted by Mary Ransome, 'The Press in the Election of 1710', Cambridge Historical Journal (1939), vi, no. 2, 219.

163 Francis Hare, The Reception of the Palatines vindicated: in a fifth letter to a Tory Member (London, 1711), p. 4.

164 Commons' Journals, xvi, 457, 470, 472.

Islay, Loudon, and Mar, who were at this time supporting the Court, voted against repeal.¹⁶⁵ It was, therefore, not surprising that, on 5 February 1711, the bill was defeated by 52 to 42 votes.¹⁶⁶

The Commons were very displeased at this set-back, but managed to pass a resolution, on 14 April, castigating those who had brought over the Palatines as enemies of the Queen and kingdom.¹⁶⁷ However, moderate counsel prevailed and there was no actual motion of censure against the earl of Sunderland, regarded as the principal friend of the Palatines.¹⁶⁸ The earl of Nottingham was not among those who

165 Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv, Hanover. Calenberg Briefe, Archiv 24 England, hereafter cited as Hanover Mss., 99, f. 111. Kreienberg's dispatch to Hanover, London, 6/17 Feb. 1711.

166 These are the numbers given in H.M.C., House of Lords Mss., n.s., ix, 87-88, where the tellers are given as the Whig Lord Mohun for the majority and the Tory Lord North and Grey for the minority. Luttrell, vi, 687, gives the division as 50 to 40 votes. Lords' Journals, xix, 215 gives a list of twenty-six peers, who dissented. These were Abingdon, Anglesey, Beaufort, Berkshire, Clarendon, Conway, Denbigh, Ferrers, Guernsey, North and Grey, Northumberland, Nottingham, Say and Seal, Scarsdale, Weymouth, and Winchelsea; the archbishop of York, and the bishops of Chester, Exeter, Rochester, and Winchester; and the Scottish peers Annandale, Balmerino, Eglinton, Kilsyth, and Marischal. All twenty-six were Tories. Seventeen of the English bishops and peers voted Sacheverell not guilty in 1710, while only Winchelsea had voted him guilty. Winchelsea and the bishop of Winchester had supported the Occasional Conformity bill in 1703. The bishop of Exeter was renowned for his high church works, and his translation to Exeter in 1708 had been opposed by the Whigs. Clarendon served the Tory ministry as ambassador-extraordinary to Hanover, May-August 1714, and had been made a P.C. in 1711. Of the Scottish peers only Eglinton had not opposed the Union, while Kilsyth and Marischal had Jacobite sympathies and Balmerino was dismissed from all his posts on the accession of George I.

167 Commons' Journals, xvi, 598.

168 Burnet, vi, 40.

wished to play down the issue. When opening a charity school, on 14 May 1711, he brought up the question of the Palatines: "We all know we labour under heavy taxes.... The rich are impover'ished & the poor made poorer, & all this aggravated by the letting in of the Palatines & taking the poor's bread & giving it to strangers. Moreover the poor laws for their relief are so defective — because of slackness, idleness, immorality & laxity of enforcement — that they are more the occasion of making the poor than relieving them."¹⁶⁹ Swift's Tory newspaper, The Examiner, also continued to attack the whole Whig policy of welcoming foreigners:

"Some Persons, whom the Voice of the Nation authorizeth me to call her Enemies, taking Advantage of the general Naturalization Act, had invited over a great Number of Foreigners of all Religions, under the Name of Palatines; who understood no Trade or Handicraft; yet rather chose to beg than labour; who besides infesting our Streets, bred contagious Diseases, by which we lost in Natives, thrice the Number of what we gained in foreigners."¹⁷⁰

The Tories did not give up their plan to repeal the act. On 22 December 1711 three Tories, Campion, Finch, and Manley, prepared another bill to repeal the General Naturalization Act, which was hurried through the House by 22 January 1712.¹⁷¹ In the Lords the recent creation of twelve new Tory peers meant that the bill met with a more favourable reception and was carried by 57 to 39 votes.¹⁷² For the

169 Leicester Record Office. Finch Mss., box vi, bundle 24.

170 The Examiner, no. 44, 7 June 1711.

171 Commons' Journals, xvii, 24-34.

172 Luttrell, vi, 721.

present the Tory policy towards foreigners prevailed, and was indeed exaggerated during the difficult peace negotiations, when the Dutch and Austrians were regarded as wishing to prolong the war at Britain's expense. The accession of a German prince was accepted by most Tories, though with obvious distaste. They still maintained a dislike of all foreigners even when it was politically disastrous. In the first election campaign under George I the Tories still attacked the Whigs, who "would graft so many new exotick scyons of quite different and base species, as entirely to alter the property of the old honest English Stock."¹⁷³

Under the Hanoverians the Tories' hostility to foreigners, their sentimental attachment to the Jacobite cause, and the peace they made at Utrecht helped to confine them to the rôle of an ineffectual 'country' opposition. It has been cogently argued that even in Anne's reign the Tories had many of the attributes of a 'country' party.¹⁷⁴ After 1694 Robert Harley had won over many Tories by advocating the purification of parliament and the prevention of financial abuse. Thus by Anne's reign "the Tory, apart from public issues, stood for free and frequent elections, sharp punishment for bribery and electoral

¹⁷³ Bishop Atterbury, 'English Advice to the Freeholders of England', Somers Tracts, xiii, 537. At the same time a Whig pamphlet was published, with the same title, parodying Atterbury and defending the welcome given to the Palatines. Ibid., especially 554-555.

¹⁷⁴ Plumb's Political Stability, pp. 140-41, 151, and 154-5.

corruption, low taxation, financial rectitude, accountability to Parliament, the exclusion of all place-holders, and a sound land-qualification for Members";¹⁷⁵ a programme which was essentially oppositional. This should not be over-stressed, since there were also country Whigs, like Sir Peter King and Sidney Wortley Montagu, who supported measures like the place bills. Moreover this 'country' programme was not the major platform of the Tory party in Anne's reign. It contributed to the Tories' hostility to the moneyed interest and to their emphasis on the landed interest, but it was of minor importance compared to the major issues like the Church, the war, and the succession. Nevertheless it does help to explain the difficulties Tory ministers tended to have with their own back-benchers. It was one of the several inherent contradictions of Toryism.

175 Ibid., p. 151.

Chapter Two.

The Membership and Composition of the Tory Party.

It is clear from the previous section that in the reign of Queen Anne men certainly detected differences in political principle between the Tories and the Whigs. In their private correspondence and in their public pamphlets and speeches they recognised several distinctions between Tories and Whigs, in, for instance, their attitudes to the Anglican church, the war, and the Palatines. Moreover their political activities in parliament show that they acted upon these different principles. Though some men in political life always supported the Court and though frequently the party disputes degenerated into mere faction, on many issues of the day a man could follow a definite Whig or Tory line. He tended to vote consistently with one party or the other. An M.P., who supported the Occasional Conformity bills, would not only support Dr. Sacheverell, but was likely to oppose the land war, hate the moneyed men of the Bank of England, and seek to stem the tide of immigration. It seems obvious then that a study of the Tory party should not only define what may be regarded as that party's political principles, but should seek to discover which individuals, and what types of individual, held these views. For the more important members of both houses of parliament this is not a difficult task. The published debates and journals of both houses, the large collections of private correspondence, and many secondary sources, provide an historian

with a great deal of evidence on the views, the voting records, and the work and connections, of prominent political figures. Thus we know that William Cowper and Lord Somers were important, and consistent, Whigs and that they were both lawyers; that William Bromley and Sir Edward Seymour were high church Tories and country gentlemen; that Sir Gilbert Heathcote was a Whig and a director of the Bank of England; that James Stanhope was a Whig and an army officer. The correspondence and papers of men like Harley, Marlborough, and Nottingham are vast. Any adequate analysis of the membership and composition of the Tory party, however, requires a knowledge of the background and political activity of every member of both houses of parliament for the whole reign of Queen Anne. It cannot be claimed that this kind of evidence, which is analysed in the following pages, is completely accurate. The extant voting lists themselves are not one hundred per cent accurate, and a member, calculated below as a squire, may have also been connected with trade. Nonetheless, it is unlikely that any inaccuracies or omissions would seriously unbalance the picture which emerges from an examination of the available evidence.

The composition of the house of Lords is more easily investigated than the house of Commons for there were fewer peers and more of them were politically active. More of the peers have left behind political correspondence and there are brief biographies of all the lay peers in The Complete Peerage, and nearly all the bishops merit a mention in The Dictionary of National Biography. These works sometimes

give details of an individual's political beliefs and actions, and also mention the offices and places held during his career. The debates and journals of the Lords give more information on the speeches and votes of the peers than do the corresponding volumes for the members of the lower house. Thus Willaim Cobbett's Parliamentary History provides division lists for the peers on the Occasional Conformity bill of 1703 and the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell in 1710,¹ and the Lords' Journals have numerous lists of peers protesting against various bills and resolutions.² Among the Hanover papers in the British Museum there is a list of the English peers, divided according to their allegiance to the Pretender or the house of Hanover.³ From these various sources the majority of the peers can be given accurate party labels.⁴ It is only worth analysing their voting records since few of them can be placed in other useful categories. None of them were directors of the Bank of England nor gained most of their income from trade. Not enough were army officers or lawyers to justifying making distinctions between the professions of Whig and Tory peers.

1 Parliamentary History, vi, 170-1 and 886-7.

2 For example there is a list of those peers who protested at the Tories' attack on the conduct of the war in Spain in the debates of January 1711, and another list of those who signed a protest against the Schism bill in June 1714. Lords' Journals, xix, 213 and 717.

3 B.M. Stowe Ms., 224, ff. 330-1.

4 For a list of the more prominent Tory lords, see Appendix I, pp.193-197.

The membership and composition of the Commons warrants a more detailed investigation. The names and seats of every member of the Commons for the reign of Queen Anne can be culled from The Return of Names of every Member returned to serve in each Parliament.⁵ The result is a list of nearly 1250 members, including those who only sat for short periods or never even entered the House following their election. These names can be collated with the ten extant voting lists for the reign of Queen Anne. These lists are spread over all five of Anne's parliaments and so only 156 of all the M.P.s of the reign are not on one or another. Moreover the lists are particularly useful since they cover some major issues, which sharply divided Whigs and Tories. The attitudes of many members towards the Established Church can be seen by looking at the list of those who wished to tack the Occasional Conformity bill to the land tax in 1704, and at the list of those who voted for and against Dr. Sacheverell in 1710. There are lists on commercial issues, on the South Sea bill in 1711 and a very important division list on the Commercial Treaty with France in 1713. The lists of those members who voted for 'no peace without Spain' in December 1711, and of those who voted against the expulsion of Richard Steele in 1714, give us the names of many of those who opposed the terms of the peace of Utrecht. The list of those members, who supported the General Naturalization Act, shows who welcomed foreign immigrants, while the division list on whether to agree with the

⁵ Two volumes, published by order of the Commons (London, 1878-9).

Lords' amendment to the Abjuration Oath gives us the names of those hostile or sympathetic to non-jurors and Jacobites. Though the lists are not entirely reliable, for example there are slightly different versions of some of them and a few include members who could not have voted at that division, yet Dr. Speck⁶ has shown that the discrepancies only affect a very small number of members - less than fifty in all. These ten voting lists can be supplemented by four other compilations, which attach party labels to M.P.s. There is a list of the newly elected members to the 1705 parliament, in which they are divided into Churchmen, True Church, High Church, Low Church, etc.⁷ Some 475 members elected in 1710 are listed as Tories, Whigs and 'doubtful'.⁸ Abel Boyer published a list of the members of the October Club,⁹ and finally there is a complete list of the 1713 and 1715 general election results, with the M.P.s labelled as Whigs or Tories.¹⁰ These four compilations suffer from the inaccuracies evident in the ten voting lists. The first two are particularly unreliable, but the other two seem remarkably accurate. Treated with caution these compilations supply

6 W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-14: a study in political organisation', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1965), chapter two, pp. 59-108.

7 B.M. Stowe Ms. 354, ff. 161-2 and B.M. Egerton Ms. 3345 (2).

8 B.M. Stowe Ms. 223, ff. 453-6.

9 Boyer's Political State, iii, 117-122.

10 Lincolnshire Archives Office. Worsley Ms. no. I. For comments on this list see Plumb's Political Stability, pp. 130 n., 190-194. For a list of the more prominent Tory M.P.s, see Appendix II, pp.

valuable additional information about the party allegiance of many members of the house of Commons.

Working from the voting lists and the other compilations it is possible to determine which M.P.s were Tories and which were Whigs. Having distinguished the majority of M.P.s according to their party allegiance it is possible to determine something of the strength and distribution of the Tory party. It is clear for instance that there was much substance in the Tories' claim that they represented the majority of the political nation. The Tories had a natural majority, which even the opposition of the Court could do little to dent. In 1705 the Tory party was divided and what Court influence there was, was used to defeat the tackers, the extreme Tories. Yet still the Tories were in a majority after the 1705 election. Even in 1708, with everything in its favour, the Court-Whig alliance could only secure a majority of about fifty.¹¹ Of the safe seats, those which were held by the same party throughout the reign, the Tories controlled 165 while the Whigs controlled only 83 of them.¹² There is also a great deal of evidence to support the Tories'

11 In his thesis, op.cit., p. 419 n., Dr. Speck gives his calculations of the election results in tabulated form:

	1702	1705	1708	1710	1713
Tories	314	263	230	329	361
Whigs	199	250	283	283	152
Majority	115 Tories	13 Tories	53 Whigs	145 Tories	209 Tories

12 Ibid., p. 306. Plumb's Political Stability, pp. 71, 135-6, 146, accepts that the Tories represented the majority of the political nation.

claim that they were the representatives of the landed interest, though, of course, the majority of the Whigs were also landed gentry. Of the forty English counties not one could be claimed as a Whig preserve. Not even in Bedfordshire, where the Russell family was pre-eminent, or in Buckinghamshire, where Lord Wharton was very active, could the Whigs prevent Tory successes. On the other hand in nine counties the Tories captured both seats in all the elections of the reign.¹³ In another sixteen counties the Tories always held at least one seat in every election.¹⁴ Taking all eighty English county seats into consideration the Tories captured more than sixty of them in three general elections during the reign and only on one occasion failed to secure half of them.¹⁵ An examination of the twelve single-seat Welsh counties shows an even greater preponderance of Tories. In each election the Tories never failed to win fewer than ten of the twelve seats and in 1710 they swept the board. Only three Welsh counties¹⁶ ever had a Whig representative

13 Devon, Dorset, Herefordshire, Northants, Somerset, Staffordshire, Suffolk, Warwickshire, and Wiltshire.

14 Berkshire, Cornwall, Cumberland, Derbyshire, Durham, Essex, Hertfordshire, Lancashire, Leicestershire, Northumberland, Nottinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Rutland, Westmorland, Worcestershire, and Yorkshire.

15 The figures are: 62 Tories for county seats in 1702, 45 in 1705, 38 in 1708, 65 in 1710 and 69 in 1713. The other seats were not all held by Whigs for all 'courtiers' and 'doubtfuls' have been counted as non-Tories. It will be seen that the number of Tory county seats varied with the success of the Tory party in the election as a whole. However, it should be stressed that in 1705 the Tories had a majority of 13, but captured 45 county seats, whereas in 1708 the Whigs had a majority of 53, but could only secure 42 county seats.

16 Cardiganshire, Carmarthenshire, and Pembrokeshire.

and the Whigs only recorded seven successes in the whole reign.

The Tories not only controlled a majority of county seats, but they were particularly strong in the rural and more backward areas of Wales, the south west, and the north. In addition to their success in the Welsh county seats the Tories consistently held eight Welsh boroughs,¹⁷ while the Whigs could only dominate one.¹⁸ In the south-west the Tories won the county seats in every election in Devon, Dorset, Somerset, and Wiltshire and only lost one seat in Cornwall in 1705 and 1708. In the six northern counties, of sixty county elections during the reign, the Tories won thirty-eight. It should be emphasised that the counties were the preserve of the landed interest. Only seven men connected with finance or trade ever represented an English county seat¹⁹ and only two did so for a Welsh county.²⁰ While the Tory squires dominated the county seats the Whigs concentrated their strength in the

17 Beaumaris, Brecon, Caernarvon, Cardigan, Denbigh, Flint, Haverford-West, and Radnor.

18 Carmarthen.

19 Sir Francis Blake (Whig member for Northumberland 1702-5), Sir Robert Davers (Tory member for Suffolk 1705-15), Peter Gott (Whig member for Sussex 1708-10), Sir James Lowther (Whig member for Cumberland 1708-15), George Pitt, who was really a squire but was made a director of the South Sea Company (Tory member for Hampshire 1702-5 and 1710-13), Sir Richard Onslow (Whig member for Surrey 1702-10 and 1713-15), Sir William Scawen (Whig member for Surrey 1705-10), Sir Anthony Sturt (Tory member for Hampshire 1713-15), and John Wilkins (Tory member for Leicestershire 1702-8).

20 John Jeffreys (Tory member for Brecknockshire 1702-5) and Sir Humphrey Mackworth (Tory member for Cardiganshire 1702-5 and 1710-13).

boroughs, especially those with a strong trading influence. Whig financiers like Sir William Ashurst and Sir Gilbert Heathcote held London seats, and Whig merchants like Charles Cox, Sir William Daines, Thomas Johnson and Philip Papillon sat for Southwark, Bristol, Liverpool, and Dover respectively. In fact the Whigs predominated in all the major trading constituencies, *viz.*, Bristol, Dover, Great Yarmouth, Hull, King's Lynn, Liverpool, London, Newcastle, Norwich, Plymouth, Southwark, and Westminster. The Tories frequently asserted that the Whigs used corrupt methods to control the smaller boroughs. Swift argued that the Whigs had always complained that the Tories were in the majority in the Commons "till they had learned those admirable Expedients for deciding Elections, and influencing distant Boroughs, by powerful Motives from the City."²¹ It would be very difficult to prove that the Whigs were more corrupt in the elections than the Tories and it seems more likely that each party predominated in those types of seats where their connections and interests carried more weight.

Our analysis has only established so far the distribution of Tory seats, with the suggestion of a link between the Tory strength in the counties and the Tories' claim to represent the landed interest. In order to establish the actual composition of the Tory party we need to study the economic interests and professional training and qualifications of all its members in the Commons. This entails an investigation of the

²¹ The Examiner, no. 14, 9 Nov. 1711.

background of every single M.P. during the reign of Anne. The analysis that follows is based on the biographical details amassed by other historians, though the conclusions reached are entirely my own work. The most valuable source of such biographical information has been the research carried out by Professor Robert Walcott. In addition to his English Politics in the Early Eighteenth Century, there is his microfilm, with details of every M.P. of the reign of Anne, which he deposited with the History of Parliament Trust.²² This mass of data has been checked against the research work of two historians, Elizabeth Cunningham and Mary Ransome, whose theses on the 1705 and 1710 elections²³ contain short biographies of all the members elected on those occasions. The researches of Marjorie McHattie on the mercantile interest in the 1710-13 parliament and of Patricia M. Scholes on the Dissenting influence in the Commons²⁴ have also proved useful.²⁵

In the reign of Queen Anne only fifty-one M.P.s could be regarded as belonging to the financial interest, that is as a director of the Bank of England or of one of the great trading companies. Two of these

22 I am grateful to Mr. G. S. Holmes of Glasgow University for allowing me to use his copy of this microfilm

23 Elizabeth Cunningham, 'The General Election of 1705' and Mary Ransome, 'The General Election of 1710', unpublished London M.A. theses (both 1939).

24 Marjorie McHattie, 'Mercantile Interests in the House of Commons 1710-13', unpublished Manchester M.A. thesis (1949) and P. M. Scholes, 'Parliament and the Protestant Dissenters 1702-1719', unpublished London M.A. thesis (1962).

25 It should perhaps be emphasised that the conclusions drawn from an analysis of these various sources are entirely my own.

members, Sir Humphrey Mackworth and Thomas Millington, were directors of the Mine Adventurers' Company. Since this was a fraudulent venture and neither of these were financiers in any other sense they may be disregarded.²⁶ Of the remaining forty-nine members, twenty-one consistently voted Whig²⁷ during the reign and only seven always voted Tory,²⁸ and of these Robert Benson had no financial interest until he was made a director of the South Sea Company in 1711 as a political nominee of Robert Harley. It is necessary to look a little more carefully at other aspects than voting consistency of the remaining members, for twenty one is too high a figure to leave out of the reckoning. Three of these twenty one were probably Whigs, namely George Boddington, a Dissenter, who was unseated by a Tory majority in November 1702 before he could register a vote; William Jolliffe, the father-in-law of Philip Papillon, a Whig M.P., and a member who could have appeared on four Tory lists 1700-1704 but didn't; and Sir Fisher Trench, whose election was declared void by a Tory house in May 1714 and who is labelled as a Whig in Worsley Ms. no. 1.

26 Mackworth was a Tory, indeed a Tacker, who was heir to extensive estates in Wales. Millington was a royal physician and does not appear on any of the extant voting lists.

27 Sir William Ashurst, Robert Bristow, Sir Robert Clayton, Sir John Cope, William Cotesworth, James Craggs snr., Sir Francis Dashwood, Josiah Diston, George Dodington, Sir John Eyles, Sir Henry Furnese, Peter Gott, Sir Nathaniel Gould, Sir Gilbert Heathcote, Edward Hopkins, Sir Richard Onslow, John Rudge, Thomas Scawen, Sir William Scawen, Samuel Shepheard snr., and William Thompson (Orford and Ipswich).

28 Sir James Bateman, Robert Benson, Sir Robert Child, Thomas Herne, George Powell, Thomas Vernon, and Sir William Withers.

Another ten were Tories, though four of them recorded Whig votes: Arthur Moore in 1706 when, as a placeman, he was really voting for the Court; Sir Francis Child and Frederick Herne, who opposed the South Sea bill in 1711 on financial grounds; and Nathaniel Herne, who opposed the Commercial Treaty with France in 1713 for similar reasons. The other six Tories, none of whom recorded a vote, were Sir Thomas Cooke, who had voted Tory in 1700 and 1701; Sir Ambrose Crowley, who was appointed deputy-governor of the South Sea Company in 1712 and who appears as a Tory on the Worsley list; Sir Thomas Davall, who voted Tory in 1700 and 1701; Sir John Fleet, who voted Tory in 1700; Richard Lockwood, who appears as a Tory on the Worsley list; and Sir George Mathews, who was seated upon petition by a Tory majority in 1712. Sir Richard Hoare, George Pitt and Sir Samuel Ongley were all made directors of the South Sea Company in 1711, but all their votes after that date were with the Whig opposition.²⁹ Pitt was the only one of the three who had previously voted Tory and can probably be considered as an Hanoverian Tory. It should be added that he had not been a financier until he was made a director of the South Sea Company. The other two cannot fairly be listed among the Tories or the Whigs. Five other financiers cannot be given a party label. Benjamin Bathurst did not record a vote and his greatest friend was Marlborough, a courtier. John Aislable and Sir John Ward appear on both Whig and Tory lists, for no clear reason, while James Brydges and Kenrick Edisbury

²⁹ Pitt and Hoare opposed the Commercial Treaty on 1713, and Pitt and Ongley voted against the expulsion of Steele in 1714.

always voted for the Court side. So, to sum up, the forty-nine financiers can be divided into twenty-four Whigs and eighteen Tories, of whom Benson and Pitt can be considered as 'amateurs'. Seven others cannot be safely classified.

Though the consistent Whig financiers had heavily outnumbered the consistent Tories the final list of party men among the financiers reduces the numerical superiority of the Whigs. Yet upon closer investigation the Whig preponderance among the leading financiers is restored. Among the Tories Sir Francis Child and Sir Thomas Davall were private bankers and only Sir James Bateman was a director, and in fact a former governor, of the Bank of England. Batemen was not a staunch Tory for in 1710 he had failed to gain a London seat against Tory opponents and after 1714 he began supporting the Whigs. On the other hand there were fourteen of the Whig financiers who had been directors of the Bank of England,³⁰ and another, Edward Hopkins, was a money lender and broker. The Tories did have a slight superiority among those who had been directors of the East India Company, but it should be remembered that this company was a product of the union of the old Tory and the new Whig companies.³¹ The South Sea Company was dominated by Tories during

30 Ashurst, Boddington, Bristow, Clayton, Cope, Diston, Eyles, Furnese, Gott, Gould, Rudge, the two Scawens, and William Thompson.

31 The Tory directors of the East India company were Bateman, Child, Cooke, Fleet, the three Hernes, Mathews, Moore, Powell, Vernon, and Withers. The Whig directors were Cotesworth, Craggs snr., Dashwood, Dodington, Furnese, Jolliffe and Shepheard snr.

Anne's reign for it was set up by a Tory ministry, though after 1714 Whigs like James Craggs senior, Sir John Eyles and Sir Fisher Tench were directors. Few M.P.s from either party were directors of other trading organisations like the Levant and African companies.

The preponderance of Whigs among the financial classes was probably even greater than appears from an analysis of those who sat in parliament during Anne's reign. Professor Habakkuk has concluded that in the period 1680-1740 the financial classes had few connections with the landowners:

"The expansion of the field of investment after 1690, the growth of a wide range of alternatives to the purchase of land, and the development of the money market which the increase of easily realisable investments made possible - all these developments were making the mercantile and financial classes of England a more coherent and specialised group and centring their interests more completely in London. And though the connections between commercial capital and landowners were manifold they were not those of personnel. There was less interlocking of the two classes than there had been under Elizabeth and the early Stuarts."³²

If the two interests, financial and landed, were not interconnected through personnel it would help to explain why the one tended to support the Whigs and the other the Tories. Moreover Professor Habakkuk has shown that during this same period there was a continual diminution of the area of land held by the landed gentry and the smaller squires. Their land was not only being absorbed by the great county families, but

32 H. J. Habakkuk, 'English Landerownership, 1680-1740', Economic History Review (1939), x, 17.

by the influx of professional and trading classes from the London area.³³ Since the gentry bore the burden of a heavy land tax and the financiers were finding even better investments we have an explanation of the bitterness expressed by the Tory country gentlemen against the Whig moneyed classes. It also explains why the Tories were so strong in the rural and backward areas of Wales, the north, and the south west.

When we examine those members who were connected with trade and manufacturing, as distinct from financiers, we find that the Whigs again outnumbered the Tories. Some one hundred and nineteen members, who represented seats in England and Wales, were merchants. Of these, sixty two consistently voted Whig³⁴ and only thirty seven always voted Tory.³⁵

33 *Ibid.*, 2-17. In the late seventeenth century the gentry were badly hit by the sharp depressions and regularly complained about uncollected rents. See D. C. Coleman, 'London Scriveners and the Estate Market in the Later Seventeenth Century', *ibid.* (1951), iv, 221-230.

34 Sir James Ashe, Ralph Bell, William Betts, Sir Michael Biddulph, Sir Lambert Blackwell, Sir Francis Blake, Sir Owen Buckingham, Owen Buckingham, John Burridge, John Burridge jnr., Robert Burridge, William Carr, Francis Chamberlayne, John Chaplin, John Cholmley, Awnsham Churchill, William Churchill, John Cleveland, Sir Charles Cox, Sir Thomas D'aeth, Sir William Daines, John Dibble, Edmund Dummer, Sir Gervase Elwes, George England, Sir Bartholomew Gracedieu, Thomas Guy, Richard Harnage, Sir William Hodges, John Hopkins, William Hucks, Jonathan Hutchinson, Sir Matthew Jennison, Sir Thomas Johnson, John Knight, John Lade, Sir Edward Lawrence, William Lloyd, John London, Sir James Lowther, William Maister, Sir Cleve Moore, John Morgan, James Nicholson, Richard Norris, Sir Gregory Page, Philip Papillon, Sir William Phippard, Thomas Pitt snr., Sir Isaac Rebow, Thomas Rudge, Sir William Robinson, Sir John Rogers, Sir William St. Quintin, Sir Samuel Sambrooke, Francis Shepherd, Samuel Trefusis, Sir John Turner, William Wallis, Sir Thomas Webster, Richard Woollaston, and Robert Yate.

35 Sir William Blackett (2nd bart.), Thomas Bliss, Thomas Blofield, Arthur Champneys, Henry Chivers, William Clayton, Edward Colston jnr., Thomas Coulson, Sir Thomas Crosse, Sir Robert Davers, Paul Docminique, Sir Charles Duncombe, Richard Ferrier, Leonard Gale, Sir Samuel Garrard,

This leaves twenty members, who need to be investigated further. Three of these, though they did not appear on any voting list, were probably Whigs, namely, Edmund Halsey, unseated by a Tory house in 1712, Joseph Styles, unseated by a Tory house in 1703, and Nathaniel Symonds, who succeeded Colonel Townshend at Great Yarmouth in November 1709 with the Townshend interest behind him. Another twelve were Tories. Five do not appear on any voting list, but appear as Tories on one or other of the four compilations; viz. Robert Bene, Felix Calvert, Edward Colston Senior, Jasper Ratcliffe and Sir Anthony Sturt. One member, Sir William Blackett, 1st bart., did not register a vote in Anne's reign, but he had been a strong Tory in William's reign. Three members voted Tory before 1713, but then became Hanoverian Tories, namely, William Johnson, George Newland, and Robert Pitt. Three members, John Cass, William Newland and Samuel Shephard, appear as Tories on the compilations though they voted with the opposition in 1713, probably as Hanoverian Tories. Thus there were probably sixty five Whig and forty nine Tories merchants. Five merchants cannot be given any party label.³⁶ It is also difficult to attach the

William Gore, Sir Henry Gough, Thomas Heath, Robert Heysham, William Heysham, Edward Jeffreys, Sir Jeffrey Jeffreys, John Jeffreys, Sir Henry Johnson, Walter Kent, Sir William Lewen, Sir Joseph Martin, John Mead, Sir John Parsons, Thomas Renda, Samuel Robinson, John Snell, Samuel Swift, Thomas Webb, John Wilkins, Nicholas Wood, and Gilbert Yarde.

³⁶ Joseph Earle, William Hooker, John Pery, William Prichard and Gilbert Searle.

terms Whig and Tory to Scottish merchants. Ten merchants from Scotland sat in the united parliament after 1707 and it is tentatively suggested that five of these supported the Whigs while only two voted with the Tories.³⁷ The overall picture shows that the Whigs had a greater stake in the merchant communities than the Tories. Since the Tories were in the majority in four out of the five parliaments during the reign the proportion of Whig to Tory merchants appears even more significant.³⁸

So far the distribution and composition of the Tory party has borne out the Tory claim that they represented the landed interest while the Whigs were the moneyed and mercantile groups. Since the two parties differed in their attitudes to the war, and the Tories in particular opposed a land war, it is worth examining how large a proportion of each party was composed of officers of the armed forces. This line of research is bedeviled by two special problems. Officers in both services spent much of their time out of the country and so could not always be regular

37 William Cochrane, Alexander Duff, Sir William Gordon, Sir Patrick Johnstone, and Thomas Smith voted with the Whigs and Sir John Shaw and George Yeamen with the Tories. The other three Scottish merchants were George Allardyce, James Oswald and Robert Roger.

38 Marjorie McHattie, 'Mercantile Interests in the House of Commons 1710-1713', unpublished Manchester M.A. thesis (1949), chapter 5, did not see any significant preponderance of merchants in any one of the parties, but she was examining a parliament in which the Tories, with a majority of nearly 150, might have been expected to have more merchant supporters than the Whigs. The fact that this was not so suggests that merchants were divided unequally on the side of the Whigs.

attenders at the Commons. For example, neither General Webb nor Admiral Fairfax recorded a vote on any of the ten occasions for which we have voting lists. Secondly, promotion to the highest ranks depended on royal favour and so ambitious officers were particularly susceptible to Court pressure. Nevertheless it is worth tackling the problem. One hundred and eleven members who sat for English or Welsh seats were, at one stage in their lives, officers in the army. Fifty-seven of these consistently voted Whig³⁹ and only twenty-five were always Tories.⁴⁰

39 Edward Ashe, John Berkeley, Richard Boyle, Henry Bradshaigh, William Cadogan, Adam Cardonnel, Charles Churchill, Lord Cutts, Sir Conyers Darcy, Sir John Delaval, Sir Tristram Dillington, Thomas Dodson, Thomas Dove, William Egerton, Thomas Erle, John Fane, Thomas Farington, George Fletcher, Sir John Germaine, Francis Godfrey, Sydney Godolphin, Daniel Harvey, Sir Charles Hotham, Emmanuel Howe, Henry Ireton, Sir John Jennings, James Kendall, Henry Lumley (member for Arundel), Edward Maine, Charles Mason, Thomas Meredith, Edward Montague, Henry Mordaunt, John, Lord Mordaunt, Anthony Morgan, Mathew Ducie Morton, Sir Richard Onslow, Thomas Pitt, Aubrey Porter, Charles Powlett, Lord William Pawlett, George Robinson, Algernon Seymour, James Stanhope, Thomas Stanwix, Sir Richard Steele, Richard Sutton, Sir Richard Temple, Roger Townshend, Sir Thomas Travell, Charles Trelawney, Thomas Weld, Goodwin Wharton, Henry Withers, Sir John Wittewrong, Henry Worsley and Robert Wroth.

40 Sir Henry Bellasyse, Henry Bertie, John Boteler, Robert Byerly, William Cary, Henry Chivers, Sir Walter Clarges, Henry Cornewall, Robert Crawford, George Dashwood, Robert Echlin, Bernard Granville, John Hardres, John Hill, Henry Holmes, Alexander Luttrell, Sir Christopher Musgrave, Charles North, Thomas Pierce, Edward Rigby, Charles Seymour, William Seymour, Sir Harry Trelawny, Dixie Windsor, and Thomas Windsor. This list includes three officers, Clarges, Cornewall and Musgrave, who had never served since the Revolution; two officers, Chivers and Byerley, who retired in the early years of William III; and another two, Bellasyse and Dixie Windsor, who were dismissed in 1704 and 1707 respectively.

Another ten officers can probably be classed as Whigs, viz. Thomas Fairfax and Michael Fleming, who were supported by Lord Wharton's electoral interest; Charles Withers, brother of the Whig Henry Withers and seated on petition by a Whig house in 1708; James Stanley, who as earl of Derby, was a Whig peer; Francis Palmes, who became envoy to Turin in 1709, and William Kerr, who became a groom of the bedchamber to the Prince of Wales in 1715, both at times of Whig ascendancy; Edward Soames, Thomas Stringer, and William Henry Nassau-Zulestein, who were active supporters of William III; and John Shrimpton, who became governor of Gibraltar in 1706. An additional fifteen army officers can also be included among the supporters of the Tory party, viz., John Ashburnham, son in law of Ormonde, who was promoted colonel in 1713; James Barry, a suspected Jacobite in 1715; Charles Boyle (earl of Orrery), who became a Tory peer in 1712; John Granville, Samuel Masham, and Maurice Thompson, who also became Tory peers; Thomas Carew, who voted Tory in 1701, and Henry Lumley (Sussex), who voted Tory in 1700; Thomas Harrison, who was unseated in favour of a Whig in December 1708; Richard Goddard, Henry Trenchard, John Richmond Webb and Andrew Windsor, who are all labelled Tories in the compilation for the 1710 election; Edmund Webb, a gentleman usher to Prince George from 1702; and Lewis Oglethorpe, whose family were all Tories. We now have sixty-seven Whig officers and only forty Tories, with five officers who defy any classification. ⁴¹ With

⁴¹ Sir Harry Goring and Thomas King, whose voting records are very inconsistent; Richard Munden and Robert Pitt for whom there is not enough information; and Sir Roger Bradshaigh, who ~~also~~ supported the Court.

the army officers it is difficult to decide whether the majority were genuine Whigs or merely supported the Whigs because that party favoured the land war. However, there can be no doubt that the Whigs derived much greater support from the army than did the Tories. Indeed if the Scottish⁴² army officers are examined, no fewer than seventeen were Whig supporters⁴³ and a mere four voted Tory.

The members of the house of Commons, who were naval officers, are not easy to analyse. There were only twenty-three of them in all, who sat for constituencies in England or Wales. Sir William Gifford and Sir John Leake did not vote for the same party each time, though they always voted with the Court. Henry Killigrew and Sir Cloudisley Shovell both registered only one vote, in both cases for the Court in 1706. The case of George Churchill is even more complicated. He has always been regarded as a Tory, but on the two occasions he appears on voting lists he was on the side of the Court, in 1705 and 1706. His case illustrates the weakness of working from only a handful of voting lists. Of the fifteen navy officers⁴⁴ who voted consistently, nine were Whigs⁴⁵ and six were Tories. Three

⁴² Alexander Abercromby, James Campbell, Sir James Campbell, John Campbell, Henry Cunningham, William Dalrymple, George Douglas, John Erskine, John Gordon, Alexander Grant, John Middleton, John Montgomery, Robert Munro, Patrick Ogilvie, Sir Robert Pollock, John Stewart, and Patrick Vans.

⁴³ James Abercrombie, George Hamilton, Charles Ross, and John Sinclair. Four Scottish army officers can only be classed as doubtful, namely Sir James Campbell (5th bart.), Sir John Johnstone, Patrick Moncrieff, and James Scott.

⁴⁴ Matthew Aylmer, John Baker, George Byng, Stafford Fairborne, John Jennings, James Littleton, Henry Mordaunt, John Norris, and Sir Charles Wager.

⁴⁵ Jacob Banks, Algernon Greville, Thomas Hardy, George Rooke, George St. Loe, and James Wishart.

officers did not appear on any of the ten voting lists. However, Sir Thomas Hopson voted Tory in 1701, Robert Fairfax appears as a Tory on the Worsley list, and Charles Cornwall was only advanced when the Whigs were in power. Whichever way we classify Churchill, Killigrew and Shovell it appears that just over half the navy officers were Whigs. Clearly the Tory demands to concentrate on a naval war had not swayed many navy officers. They perhaps saw that the Tories did not have their heart in the war very long anyway and most had started their careers before Anne's accession. It is interesting to note, however, that the Whigs could hold their own among the officers of the navy during a reign when the Tories usually had a majority in parliament. In fact the only special group of members, in which the Tories were clearly in the majority, were those who had had a legal training. One hundred and seventeen M.P.s of Anne's reign had been called to the Bar although they may not all have practised. Sixty-six of these⁴⁶ were Tories, if voting lists, compilations and connections are taken into

⁴⁶ Sir Edward Acton, James Anderton, Francis Annesley, John Anstis, Sir Edward Bagott, Hon. Robert Bertie, Abraham Blackmore, Samuel Bracebridge, Thomas Bramston, Orlando Bridgeman, William Collier, John Comyns, John Conyers, Nicholas Corsellis, Sir William Coryton, William Coward, Charles Coxe, John Dalby, Robert Davy, Sir Gilbert Dolben, Francis Drewe, Thomas Edwards, William Ettrick, Henry Fleming, Richard Foley, John Gape, Sir Thomas Gery, Joseph Girdler, Sir Simon Harcourt, Simon Harcourt, Sir Charles Hedges, John Hoblyn, Sir Nicholas Hooper, John Hungerford, Archibald Hutcheson, Edward Jennings, Edmund Lambert, Sir Richard Levinz, William Levinz, Henry Lloyd, Thomas Lutwyche, Sir Humphrey Mackworth, John Meyrick, George Morley, Richard Newdigate, Sir Edward Northey, Thomas Northmore, Sir Henry Parker, Henry Pooley, Sir Thomas Powys, Sir Edmund Prideaux, John Proby, John Pugh, Sir Robert Raymond, Richard Richardson, Thomas Rowney, Francis Scobell, James Sheppard, John Snell, Samuel Trotman, Sir Edmund Turner, John Ward, Joseph Weld, Sir William Whitlock, Edward Winnington, and Richard Wynne.

account. Forty-six were Whigs⁴⁷ and five cannot be given a party label.⁴⁸
The preponderance of Tories is not excessive in view of their numerical superiority in general over the Whigs. The principles expressed by the Tories cannot be regarded as being particularly attractive to the legal mind. It would seem, however, that there was no prejudice in the Tory mind against lawyers as there was against financiers.

From an examination of the distribution and composition of the Tory party in parliament there seems to be an important correlation between these factors and the principles and prejudices of the Tories. There were fewer army officers in the Tory party and the Tories expressed opposition to Marlborough's strategy of a land war. The Tories claimed to represent the landed interest and they were stronger in the counties and the more rural areas. They were hostile to the moneyed men and hardly any of them

47 John Asgill, Scorie Barker, Sir John Bennet, John Birch, Dennis Bond William Bromley (Tewkesbury), Lawrence Carter, Sir Thomas Clarke, Maynard Colchester, Hon. Spencer Compton, Spencer Cowper, William Cowper, Alexander Denton, Fleetwood Dormer, John Eyre, Sir Robert Eyre, William Farrer, Francis Foote, William Guidott, Stephen Harvey, Sir John Hawles, Sir Roger Hill, Sir Joseph Jekyll, William Jessop, Sir Peter King, Nicholas Lechmere, Sir Thomas Littleton, Sir James Lowther, James Medlycott, John Methuen, Sir James Montague, George Naylor, Anthony Nicholl, Samuel Ogle, Francis Page, Sir Thomas Parker, John Pocklington, Robert Raikes, Samuel Rolle, Robert Sherwin, Sir John Spence, William Thompson, Samuel Travers, Richard Vaughan, Henry Vincent snr., and Thomas Webb.

48 Owen Brigstock, Thomas Pemberton, John Pratt, Charles Whitaker, and Sir Cyril Wyche.

were connected with the Bank of England. A greater proportion of the Tories were connected solely with the land and with the more backward areas of the north and west. Fewer of them had experience of foreigners through financial and commercial contacts or through service in the army abroad. All these points help to explain the more insular attitude of the Tories, as evinced in their opposition to the General Naturalization Act. However, since the main distinguishing feature of the Tories was their devotion to the Church of England we need, in conclusion, to examine how far the clergy were supporters of the Tory party rather than of the Whigs. This seems to be looking, once more, for the obvious, tautological result, and yet it is worth pursuing to establish that behind the name of Tory there was a real party of men with sound reasons for the principles and prejudices they displayed.

In the reign of Anne the Tories could not count upon more support from the bishops than could the Whigs. The majority of those appointed by William III were Whiggish in their politics (though ^{not necessarily} low church in their doctrine),⁴⁹ whereas Queen Anne chose mainly from the high Church clergy. Naturally many of William III's bishops survived into the next reign when the bench of bishops was divided between the two parties. This can be seen by an examination of the electoral activities of some of the bishops. After the 1702 election Sir John Pakington, the high Church member for Worcestershire, complained of the unwarranted interference of William Lloyd, bishop of

⁴⁹ Norman Sykes, 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', E.H.R. (1935), 1, 433-64. G.V. Bennett, 'King William III and the Episcopate', Essays in Modern English Church History, ed. G.V. Bennett and J.D. Walsh, pp. 104-31, has refuted the idea that William III deliberately chose low church bishops.

Worcester. Lloyd, who had been rewarded with a bishopric for his staunch support of the Revolution, had urged the clergy of his diocese not to vote for a man of scandalous reputation like Pakington. Two of his letters were produced in evidence by Pakington and the Tory majority in the Commons addressed the Queen, expressing the hope that she would remove Bishop Lloyd from his position as Lord Almoner.⁵⁰ In 1705 Bishop Trelawny of Exeter worked to oust two Tackers from Cornwall, and succeeded in arousing his subordinate clergy to castigate him as an enemy of the Church, though he could not prevent the re-election of Sir Richard Vyvian.⁵¹ On the other hand Bishop Nicolson of Carlisle, in his Tory phase, supported the Tory Misgrave family in the elections of 1702 and 1705.⁵² Bishop Atterbury⁵³ even wrote pamphlets to influence opinion before the 1715 election.

Though the bishops were ~~becoming~~^{more} evenly divided in their party allegiance during the reign, the lower clergy were overwhelmingly Tory. This was evident in the disputes between the lower house of convocation and the bishops of the upper house.⁵⁴ It was even more clear in those two strongholds of the clergy, the universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

50 Commons' Debates, 111, 206-9 and A. Tindal Hart, William Lloyd (London, 1952), pp. 157-162.

51 Norman Sykes, 'The Cathedral Chapter of Exeter and the General Election of 1705', E.H.R. (1930), xlv, 260-272.

52 P. J. Dunn, 'The Political and Ecclesiastical Activities of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle, 1702-18', Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. (1931-2), ix, 196-8.

53 'English Advice to the Freeholders of England', Somers Tracts, xlii, 521-541.

54 See above pp. 48-49; G. Every, The High Church Party 1688-1718 (London, 1956), passim; and G. V. Bennett, White Kennett (London, 1957), pp. 66-84.

Oxford University was represented in parliament by Tories in every election during the reign, and their first member was always William Bromley, the leading high Church Tory in the Commons. At Cambridge the situation was very much the same. The only occasion on which a Tory was not elected was when Henry Boyle was successful in 1702. Yet the university more than made up for this lapse in 1705 by returning two Tories, at the cost of rejecting Francis Godolphin, the lord treasurer's son.⁵⁵ The 'tack' in 1704 was supported by both of Oxford University's members, William Bromley and Sir William Whitlock,⁵⁶ and also by the members for Oxford borough and county. Arthur Annesley, member for Cambridge University, also supported the 'tack', and Boyle was not returned in 1705 after he had failed to follow this example. In 1710 all four university members, Bromley, Whitlock, Annesley, and Dixie Windsor, supported Dr. Sacheverell.

55 "The loss of Mr. Godolphin's Election at Cambridge is no small mortification to mee, and I have now the same occasion to complain myself of the behaviour of the clergy, as some of my friends had before." Lord Godolphin to Lady Marlborough, Fryday at 7. Blenheim Palace. Marlborough Mss. E. 20.

56 Bonet, the Prussian agent, wrote of Oxford University on the occasion of the second Occasional Conformity bill: "Cette Université se croit fort intéressée à diminuer le nombre des Presbyteriens; elle travaille aussi à cela avec beaucoup de chaleur; aussi avoit-elle chargé ses Députés de porter ce Bill, & d'employer tout leur credit, & celui de leurs amis pour le faire passer." Despatch to the King of Prussia, 26 Nov./17 Dec. 1703. Deutsches Zentralarchiv, Merseburg, East Germany. Rep. XI England, hereafter cited as Prussian Mss., No. 26 B, f. 305 v. Cf. L'Hermitage's despatch to the States General, 28 Nov. 1704, in B.M.Add.Ms. 17677, 22, f. 497.

Within the universities themselves Tory sentiments were diligently cultivated. In a letter from Queen's College, Cambridge, young Metcalfe Robinson showed his surprise at the evident joy expressed at the death of William III:

"People here begin to think everything will be as well as ever, & forget why 'tis they change their garb. They express no concern for ye Lords struck out of ye Councill, nor the preferments of other people, I can't without indignation heare 'em exclaim against ye King's too much favouring ye Dutch & Dissenters, when that moderation was the only thing to make 'em all be well 'Tis not our college only but ye far greater part of ye university, that are thus affected. The fellows of St. John's triumph plainly & openly, without any reprehension, & a world of others are not so shie of declaring their sentiments, to approach thither as formerly. We are preparing verses, but I doubt not so much to lament ye poor King, as to congratulate & rejoyce with his successour."⁵⁷

In 1705 the Whig bishop of Ely complained of the heat and passion inculcated into the students at the universities and added: "At the Election at Cambridge 'twas shameful to see a hundred or more young Students, encouraged in hollowing like School-boys and Porters, and crying out, No Fanatic, No Occasional-Conformity, against two worthy Gentlemen that stood Candidates."⁵⁸ The Toryism of Oxford University was, if anything, even more uncompromising. In 1706 Dr. Charlett, president of University College, distributed copies of The Memorial of the Church of England, a pamphlet which accused the ministry of placing the Church in danger.⁵⁹ This was apparently all the more reason for Thomas Frank to

57 Studley Royal. Vyner Mss. To Sir William Robinson, Queen's College, 18 Mar. 1702.

58 Lords' Debates, ii, 159.

59 Bodleian Library, Oxford. Ballard Ms. 34, f. 141. John White to Charlett, London, 22 Jan. 1706.

suggest that Charlett should be chosen for the lower house of convocation since "ye very notion of an Oxford Head will in all probability stifle all other enquiries among those of ye clergy who call themselves H[igh] Ch[urch]." ⁶⁰ The university bitterly resented the appointment of a Whig as regius professor of divinity in January 1708, ⁶¹ and a year later, when Sir Simon Harcourt was ousted from his Abingdon seat by a petition supported by the Whig majority in the Commons, Robert Clavering wrote: "The outcry of the High-flyers here is very great with regard to Sir Simon Harcourt's election. It is a most sensible wound and extorts greater complaints from them than I have heard this great while." ⁶²

In electoral contests throughout the country the lower clergy placed their influence almost entirely at the disposal of Tory candidates. During the 1705 general election the clergy of Exeter preached that the Church was in danger from the Whiggish designs of Bishop Trelawny, and "Sir R. Vyvyan had written to Exeter that if there be want of clergymen to oppose his lordship, he would come up himself for that purpose at the head of eighty of them from Cornwall." ⁶³ In the same year 119 out of 140 Berkshire clergy supported the candidacy of Sir John Stonehouse, a Tacker. ⁶⁴ In Sussex the story had been the same and Thomas Hearne recorded: "We have

60 Christ Church Library, Oxford. Wake Mss. Arch. W. Epist., Lincoln letters, vol. 1, letter 129. To Bishop Wake, Cranfield, 24 Nov. 1707.

61 G. M. Trevelyan, England under Queen Anne, II, 320.

62 Hertfordshire Record Office. Cowper (Panshanger) Mss. To Ann Clavering, University College, Oxford, 24 Jan. 1708/9.

63 Christ Church Library, Oxford. Wake Mss. Arch. W. Epist., 17, item 79, f. 97. Rev. Blackburne to Bishop Wake, 14 May 1705.

64 The Observer, IV, nos. 9 and 16, 28 April-2nd May and 22-26 May 1705. See also Heinsius Mss., no. 1034, L'Hermitage to Heinsius, London, 9 June 1705 (n.s.).

an Account from ye Late Assizes at Horsham in Sussex yt ye Clergy of yt County in a full Body making upwards of 150 waited upon Arthur Turner Esquire ye High Sheriff & in a solemn manner gave him their thanks for standing up for ye Interest of ye Church in the late Elections."⁶⁵ In the elections of 1710, because of the recent impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell, the clergy were even more active in support of Tory candidates.⁶⁶ In the county election at York the Whig Sir William Strickland, who was hoping to retain his seat, was heavily defeated by two Tories, Lord Downe and Sir Arthur Kaye. Apparently it was "a company of damn'd priests that did him much evil; ... A great company of boys brought the Dr.'s [Sacheverell's] picture elevated upon a pole with huzza's; Sir William turned his backside on't when it was brought before the tribunal."⁶⁷ In Essex 125 out of 143 clergymen, who voted, polled singly for Sir Richard Child, the only Tory candidate to stand for the county.⁶⁸ At Lincoln three hundred clergy arrived in a body to vote for the Tory candidates, one of whom was Lewis Dymoke, a Tacker.⁶⁹ It was reported from Northampton that the clergy were

⁶⁵ Hearne, i, 23. 4 Aug. 1705.

⁶⁶ See particularly Mary Ransome, 'Church and Dissent in the Election of 1710', E.H.R. (1941), lvi, 76-89.

⁶⁷ The Letters and Papers of the Banks Family of Reyesby Abbey 1704-1760, ed. J. W. F. Hill. The Lincoln Record Society (1952), vol. 45, p. 13. Rev. William Steer to Joseph Banks, Ecclesfield, 23 Oct. 1710.

⁶⁸ Essex Record Office. Essexpoll, printed 1711.

⁶⁹ The Post-Boy. 17 Oct. 1710.

brow-beating the electors into voting for the Tory candidates.⁷⁰ The Whigs, of course, were very largely Anglican too, but their toleration of Dissenters aroused the fears and prejudices of the poorer parish clergy, who felt their whole position and status threatened. They suspected that toleration was but the first Whig step towards eventual dis-establishment. There was no doubt that the Dissenters were conspicuous supporters of the Whigs. Most of those M.P.s, who were Dissenters or supporters of the dissenting cause, were Whigs. In 1701 There were twenty-eight members⁷¹ during the reign, who could fit this description, and not one of them recorded a Tory vote, according to the extant lists. ^{There were a few Tories, like the Harleys and Foleys, who supported the Dissenters.} Whig candidates could usually count upon the dissenting vote. In 1702 David Polhill, a Junto Whig and a great-grandson of Cromwell, contested Sandwich, where he was told: "The Dutch and presbyterian interest are very great in Sandwich, most of the considerable inhabitants being either Dutchmen born, or of that extraction, and entirely presbyterian and I know nobody that can pretend more justly to the Interest of that honest party than Mr. Polhill."⁷² Sir Justinian Isham and Thomas Cartwright, the two Tory candidates for the county of Northampton in 1705, found themselves strongly opposed by the Presbyterians⁷³, and, according to Sir John Bland, "the Low Church party, as

70 The Flying-Post. 4 Nov. 1710.

71 P. M. Scholes, 'Parliament and the Protestant Dissenters 1702-1719', unpublished London M.A. thesis (1962), appendix 1, pp. 166-171.

72 Kent Record Office. Polhill Mss. Mr. Macky to David Polhill, Dover, 24 Feb. 1702.

73 Northants Record Office. Isham Correspondence, bundle 14, no. 2737 a. Sir Robert Clerke to Sir Justinian Isham, 11 Feb. 1704/5.

they call themselves, and the Dissenters of all kinds, join together in all places."⁷⁴ It was this sort of action which confirmed the worst suspicions of the Anglican clergy. It also meant that the Tories had the support of one of the most powerful vested interests in the country. The Whigs paid heavily for their religious principles for, as Bishop Wake was informed, "Dissenters are rarely numerous but in trading places, and there are not four populous towns in England in which they are near a majority. Now among the Churchmen, the clergy have and will have a standing and a powerful interest."⁷⁵

74 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 170. Bland to Robert Harley, Hulme, 14 March 1704/5.

75 Christ Church Library, Oxford. Wake Mss. Arch. W. Epist., vol. 17, misc., i, letter 243. William Wotton to Wake, 21 Mar. 1710.

Chapter Three.

The Organisation of the Tory Party.

No political party in the eighteenth century could be expected to have an organisation or party machine approaching that of a modern party. Nevertheless recent research has shown that the Whigs were in many respects an organised and efficient party.¹ They had a coherent political philosophy, leaders of a high calibre in both houses, a formidable electoral machine, and a discipline which did not easily break down in adversity. In the period 1710-1714 the Whigs were heavily defeated in two general elections yet could still harass a Tory government on all major issues. It was a triumph of organisation and leadership. By 1714 the Whigs had merited their reward of generations of political supremacy. In contrast the Tories, though enjoying the favour of Queen Anne and the support of the majority of the nation, suffered from several disadvantages which ultimately proved fatal. Their greatest handicap was the inherent contradictions of their political philosophy. It had proved impossible in 1688 to maintain both their loyalty to the Crown and their devotion to the Church. Yet, though they had decided in favour of the latter, they had refused to abandon entirely the doctrines of hereditary succession and non-resistance or a romantic attachment to the Jacobite cause.

¹ E. L. Ellis, 'The Whig Junto in relation to the development of party politics and party organisation, from its inception to 1714', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1962. Cf. Plumb's Political Stability, pp. 134-36.

The Tories' leaders never formed a united team to compare with the Whig Junto. There was a great deal of personal rancour and a lack of political judgement in Rochester's resignation in 1703, Nottingham's defection in 1711, and the Oxford-Bolingbroke rivalry of Anne's last years. While bearing in mind these divisive elements, in political philosophy and in the leadership, within the Tory party, it would still be misleading to portray the Tories as a collection of individuals or splinter groups. On the contrary there is a surprising amount of evidence to show that there existed a Tory organisation which could make the party an effective political force.

To appreciate the organisation of the Tory party it is necessary to examine all its facets. The Tories existed both at Westminster and in the nation at large. In the constituencies the main body of Tory supporters were the squires and the rural clergy. These men were both voters and propagandists. To keep them in touch with the party at Westminster they had to be supplied with details of Tory principles and policies. In this task the Tory press had a major rôle to play. Only if they were well armed with Tory propaganda could they keep the electoral machine operating smoothly. Even after they had obtained a majority in the elections the Tories had to face the problem of mobilising this support in parliament. With a membership principally composed of country gentlemen this always presented a major task. To meet the problem the Tories developed a system of party 'whips', whose function was to persuade the M.P.s and peers in their locality to attend parliament for important

debates. If the Tories, once at Westminster, were to act together they had to devise means of planning their parliamentary strategy and tactics. One of the most important of these was the political club, which allowed the Tory rank and file to hold regular meetings in congenial surroundings. Equally important were the meetings, whether formal or informal, between the Tory leaders and the backbenchers. Thus in all fundamental aspects the Tories developed a party organisation in the early eighteenth century.

The reign of Queen Anne was remarkable for the large circulation of newspapers and pamphlets devoted to politics, and for the very high calibre of the writers involved. There were numerous London newspapers and these were also distributed throughout the provinces, where each copy would be read by many people in the inns, the coffee-houses and even the churches. The London Gazette, the official government newspaper, had a circulation of six thousand copies, the Whig Post-Boy sold three thousand copies, though Defoe's Review only sold about four hundred per issue. The weekly periodicals, however, were even more successful and in 1712 The Spectator was selling 11,500 copies each week.² All these newspapers carried political news and comment, while at election times they even printed specific party propaganda and appeals to the voters in certain constituencies or on certain issues.³ In addition to the regular press there was a positive flood of political pamphlets, some of which, like

2 J. M. Price, 'A note on the circulation of the London Press, 1704-1714', Bull.Inst.Hist.Reg. (1958), xxi, 217-9.

3 Mary Ransome, 'The Press in the Election of 1710', Cambridge Historical Journal (1939), VI, ii, 209-221.

Defoe's The Shortest Way with the Dissenters, Drake's The Memorial of the Church of England, and Swift's The Conduct of the Allies, had a wider circulation and a greater impact than any newspaper. The influence of both pamphlets and newspapers was largely due to the talent of the journalists involved. Few ages could boast such an array of writing talent, endeavouring to disseminate political news and propaganda. Not only were there the truly great writers like Swift, Defoe, Steele, and Addison, but there were numerous journalists with a huge output of material, men like Abel Boyer and Arthur Mainwaring. Active politicians like Henry St. John and Robert Walpole also contributed to the political press.

The press was always important in Anne's reign, but at certain times it had even greater political influence. This was particularly so before a general election or when there was a need to marshal public opinion on a great issue such as the peace. On these occasions the Tory party could claim some success in its control and manipulation of sections of the press. In the event of general elections the Tory party's propaganda was as successful as the issues involved would allow. During the 1705 election campaign the Tories had not recovered from their split over the Tack and they found the war suddenly very popular after the great victory at Blenheim. As a result the Tories were on the defensive and it would appear that the Whigs had the better of the political exchanges in the press.⁴ Five years later the position was reversed. This time the

⁴ Elizabeth Cunningham, 'The General Election of 1705', unpublished London M.A. thesis, (1939), chapter 2, esp. pp. 41-46.

Tories had the advantage of the general outcry against the treatment of Dr. Sacheverell and the increasing opposition to the war. The Tory press made excellent use of the favourable circumstances and the Whig reply was, on the whole, unsatisfactory.⁵ When it came to enlisting support for the peace the Tory pamphlet The Conduct of the Allies was more influential than a whole host of Whig counter-blasts. On the succession issue, however, the Tory press could never give a convincing reply to the Whig press accusing the Tories of Jacobitism.

The biggest task for Tory propaganda was to maintain contact with the country squires throughout the rural areas of the north and west. In this respect the regular newsletters of Dyer, a non-juror and Jacobite, were particularly successful. These were hand-written and dispersed among the Tory faithful.⁶ Their popularity was increased by their slashing attacks on the Whigs, in which no quarter was shown. William Bowes complained of Dyer's influence in the election at Durham in 1705:

"My Election was without any opposition, & I had a great appearance of gentlemen, and freeholders with some of the prebendarys of this Church & by their Example, several of the clergy, appear'd with my colleague Sir Ro[bert] Eden, which I expect that saucy scribbler, Dyer, will take notice of (as he has done in like cases) with some

5 Mary Ransome, 'The Press in the Election of 1710', Cambridge Historical Journal (1939), VI, ii, 209-221.

6 There are collections of Dyer's newsletters in B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/320; in the Thynne collection at Longleat; and in the Newdigate Letters (microfilm) at the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

reflection on me; that fellow does abundance of mischief at this juncture, with his L[ette]r which is very common in these northern parts & I wonder he is not punished for it."⁷

Despite the successes of Swift and Dyer the Whig press often had the better of the exchanges. This had led the Tories to seek some way of curbing the Whig writers. The Whig tactic of tainting the Tories with Jacobitism led to a resolution, on 2 March 1705, by the Tory majority in the Commons "that to asperse any Member of the House of Commons with being in the interest of the pretended Prince of Wales, or of the French Government, for or in respect of his behaviour and proceedings in the House of Commons, is villainous and seditious, destructive of the Liberties of Parliament, and the freedom of elections, and tends to create a misunderstanding between her Majesty and her subjects."⁸ Even with the greater success of the Tory press after 1710 the Tory ministry brought in a Stamp Act in 1712 in an effort to curb the activities of the opposition journalists. Henry St. John, the secretary of state, arrested several writers and forced Ridpath, the author of the Flying Post, to flee to France. Yet these efforts were not entirely successful,⁹ as St. John himself confessed to Lord Strafford:

"The laws of our country are too weak to punish effectually those factious scribblers who presume to

7 B.M.Add.Ms. 28893 f. 137. To John Ellis, Durham, 18 May 1705.

8 Commons' Journals, xiv, 557.

9 J. M. Price, 'A note on the circulation of the London press, 1704-1714', Bull.Inst.Hist.Res. (1958), xxxi, 216-224 and Laurence Hanson, Government and the Press 1695-1763 (Oxford, 1936), p. 12.

blacken the brightest characters and to give even scurrilous language to those who are in the first degree of honour. This, my Lord, among others, is a symptom of the decayed condition of our government, and serves to show how fatally we mistake licentiousness for liberty."¹⁰

In the management of elections the Tories were evidently efficient and successful. It has already been shown that they secured large majorities in the general elections of 1702, 1710, and 1713, and a small majority in 1705. When the Whigs had everything in their favour in 1708 their majority was only fifty. Moreover the Tories were very much more successful in winning county seats, which were more independent and needed greater 'nursing' than most borough seats. In the elections the Tory candidates could count upon considerable support from the lower clergy¹¹, but they themselves were not inactive. A few examples will serve to illustrate the way the Tories promoted their cause in the constituencies. In 1703 Lord Ashburnham wrote to the earl of Nottingham: "I have endeavoured in the small round of my country neighbours to do the best service Iyes in me, in rendring them affectionate to the Queene, and true to the gouvernement, things necessary in my opinion, where soe many engines are still at work for the contrary."¹² Nine years later the earl

¹⁰ Letters and Correspondence of Henry St. John, Lord Viscount Bolingbroke, hereafter cited as Bolingbroke's Corr., ed. Gilbert Parke (London, 1798), ii, 486. Letter dated Whitehall, 23 July 1712.

¹¹ See above pp. 118-121.

¹² East Sussex Record Office. Ashburnham Ms. 844 f. 300. Letter dated Ashburnham, 26 Oct. 1703.

of Sussex was informing Robert Harley, earl of Oxford: "I'm not idle in keeping up ye interest for all the gentlemen on this side are very soon to dine with me: yt wee may concert matters for ye next election wch ye Whiggs begin to be very busy about."¹³ The Tories showed in 1705 that they could combat ministerial influence when they defeated Godolphin's son in the Cambridge University election.

The Tory electoral organisation also sought to retrieve individual and unexpected reverses. In 1708 a family dispute deprived Henry St. John of his seat at Wootton Bassett. Though St. John thought his Tory friends had deserted him¹⁴, when they failed to find him another seat, they had in fact made strenuous efforts to find him a safe seat elsewhere.¹⁵ When Sir Simon Harcourt lost his Abingdon seat on petition, in a house with a Whig majority, in 1709, the Tories brought him back into the house for Cardigan borough, early in 1710. On the whole it must be admitted that the Whig record in adversity was better than that of the Tories. In February 1712 Robert Walpole was expelled from the Commons for corruption, but he was promptly re-elected for King's Lynn and the Commons

13 B.M. Portland (Harley papers). Loan 29/155/6. Letter dated Chevening, 8 Aug. 1712.

14 See St. John's complaints in his letter to James Grahme, 18 July 1708 in Levens Hall Mss., box D, file S. An abbreviated form of this letter appears in H.M.C., 10th Report (Bagot Mss.), p. 341.

15 See H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 489, 491 and 515, George Granville to Robert Harley, 20 May 1708, Sir Simon Harcourt to Harley, 28 May 1708, and St. John to Harcourt, 20 Dec. 1708; and H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 190, St. John to Harley, 1 May 1708.

had to declare him incapable of sitting in the house for that parliament.¹⁶
Nevertheless in the 1713 election he was again returned. In this general election the Whigs suffered their greatest defeat. James Stanhope lost his seat at Cockermouth, but the Whig leaders promptly set about getting another one for this able politician. James Craggs contacted General Erle:

"My Lord Sunderland desires me to write to you on a subject wch I am sure you will be very glad to be servicable in if it lyes in your power. You know Mr. Stanhope has lost his election at Cockermouth, and the Governour [Thomas Pitt] having preferred his own flesh and blood at Old Sarum and Winton, he is like to be left out of Parliament unless some of our friends who are chosen at two places can & will provide for him. You may be sure all those who are sensible of the want of him are taking all necessary measures wherever 'tis proper. Your nephew Mr. Trenchard is chose for two places & I am persuaded if you have not thought of it already, you will be pleased that I put you in mind of using your credit to serve Mr. Stanhope & when I have said that I know 'tis needless to add how kindly 'twill be taken by every or anybody else."¹⁷

Stanhope was finally brought into parliament for Wendover and, unlike the Tories from 1708-10, the Whigs were not without one of their ablest speakers in the Commons. Yet even the Whig electoral organisation had its failures. In 1713 Mathew Ducie Morton lost his seat for Gloucestershire¹⁸ and Lord Wharton failed in his attempts to find Morton an alternative seat.

With so many squires among the rank and file of the party the Tory leaders also had a difficult problem in mobilising the maximum support

16 J. H. Plumb, Sir Robert Walpole, i, 182.

17 Charborough Park. Erle papers. Letter dated Althorp, 21 Sept. 1713.

18 Gloucester Record Office. Ducie Morton Mss. D 340 a. C 22/6 and 7.

Wharton to Mathew Ducie Morton, 24 April 1714 (two letters).

in parliament. When the Tories had a comfortable majority many Tory members were less willing to attend the Commons regularly; yet the same¹⁹ was not true of the Whigs. The Tory country gentlemen were generally loath to hurry to Westminster at the beginning of a session and were anxious to return to their estates as soon as possible. In 1702, when a Tory majority was assured, Thomas Bulkeley wrote of his reluctance to hurry to parliament: "I believe our meeting at ye first opening of the Session will not be so requisite now as it was the last time, soe that if we come within a weeke or ten dayes after it, we may be time enough to overtake ye²⁰ maine business." This opinion was shared by John Wynn: "The first meeting of ye house ye Speaker will be (noe doubt of it) chosen", but "we shall (I suppose) hardly be 2 thin" that we need "make any great hast for

19 English Historical Documents 1660-1714, ed. A. Browning, viii, 957 gives the average Commons' attendances as 1702-3 (198); 1703-4 (198); 1704-5 (191); 1705-6 (266); 1706-7 (223); 1707-8 (213); 1708-9 (242); 1709-10 (261); 1710-11 (205); 1711-12 (220); 1713 (221) and 1714 (221). The highest attendances were in 1705-6 when the Whig-Court alliance was seeking to thwart a small Tory majority and 1708-10 when the Whigs had a majority. Similarly W. T. Morgan 'An Eighteenth Century Election in England', Political Science Quarterly (1922), vol. 37, 602 n. shows that the highest Whig majority was 230-85 in the 1708-10 parliament (when the Whigs had a majority of 283 to 230), while the highest Tory division was 232-106 in the 1710-13 parliament (when the Tories had a majority of 329 to 186). ^{the Marlborough censure debate did in fact produce a higher division,} Though the Whigs could generally mobilise a higher percentage of their supporters in success and adversity.

20 National Library of Wales. Chirk Castle Ms. 1018. To Sir Richard Myddelton, Dynas, 8 Sept. 1702.

there will be enough I hope to chose a good one, there being so great a²¹ majority of good men chosen for this parliament." It was not just the least active members who were reluctant to spend a great deal of time in London. A prominent 'back-bencher' like Sir Justinian Isham only wished to attend for the more important parliamentary business. On one occasion he asked his son:

"Pray give me an account by Saturday's post, whether 'tis thought in town there will be a farther prorogation, and if you can't be otherwise inform'd, I would have you wait upon the Speaker with my Service, and my desire to know of him whether the sitting of the Parliamt. will be put off for a longer time for in that case I would not go up so soon, having some business which requires my stay in the country some time longer."²²

When the Tory squires did make haste to parliament for the opening of the new parliament in 1708 they were annoyed to find their leaders had decided not to put up a Tory candidate for the speakership. "My brother Walter," wrote Thomas Rowney to George Clarke, "as well as Sir John Stonehouse with several others are displeased at their journey to London I believe ye Gentlemen will be better informed of an opposition, before they will venture such another journey. Where the fault lies I am not a judge, but²³ am satisfied we have bin made fools of."

In the Lords the picture was very much the same. Though Nottingham and Rochester were regular debaters in the Lords, the Tories

21 Ibid. , Chirk Castle Ms. 1025. To Sir Richard Myddelton, Watstay, 10 Sept. 1702.

22 Northants Record Office. Isham Family Letters, 1730. To Justinian Isham, jnr., Lamport, 7 Nov. 1711.

23 Bodleian Library. Top. Ms., Oxon. b. 82, f. 16. Letter dated London, 19 Nov. 1708.

could not match the Whig Junto in application to business or in assiduous attendance at the house. After the Whig success in the 1708 election even Nottingham was not disposed to rush to Westminster for the opening of the new parliament. William Bromley urged him to change his mind: "The term is begun, has your Lordship no business at it? I hope I shall be forgiven this impertinent question."²⁴ More than a fortnight later Nottingham had still not changed his mind and Bromley pressed him to reconsider his decision:

"I am sorry to find your Lordship is much determined against coming to Town at a juncture when all advice & assistance are wanted, & when I am sure the ablest is absolutely necessary to preserve us the noble friends the E[arl] of R[ochester] & Id H[aversham], who as far as I can judge from their conversation, are both as heartily as is possible in concurring in proper measures for serving our common interest."²⁵

Taking the peerage as a whole the Whigs were the more highly organised. Peers, unlike M.P.s, had the privilege of voting by proxy, and the evidence of the house of Lords' proxy-book shows that the Whigs took more pains to ensure that their absent supporters gave their proxies to other Whig peers. During the crucial 1704-5 session, when the high Tories were planning the 'Tack', the Whigs held two proxies for every one in a Tory hand. Of course at this time the Whigs were in a majority in the Lords, but during the 1711-12 session, when the Tory ministers needed every vote they could

24 Leicester Record Office. Finch Mss. Box vi, bundle 23. Letter dated 23 Oct. 1708.

25 Ibid. Letter dated 11 Nov. 1708.

lay their hands on and when they were prepared to press the Queen to create new peers, the Whigs still held twice the number of proxies that the Tories could muster.²⁶ It was during this session that the ministry brought in the peace preliminaries signed with France. Yet though peace was longed for by many Tory peers it did not make them all rush to support the ministry in the Lords. Lord Stawell informed his fellow Tory, Lord Weymouth: "I find your Lordship designs being speedily in Town. I cannot be there this winter. I shall wish well to the Peace but am resolv'd to spend no money about it."²⁷ The creation of twelve new Tory peers did not make it plain sailing for the ministry's policies in the Lords, for, as Swift complained: "The H. of Lds is too strong in Whigs notwithstanding the new Creations. For they are very diligent and the Tories as la[zy], the side that is down has always most industry."²⁸ Unfortunately when fortune favoured the Whigs the Tories did not respond with the like diligence. After the death of the Queen there was a clear need for the Tories to concert their plans to meet the new situation. Yet while the Whigs rushed to London to show their loyalty to the Hanoverian succession many Tories appeared to sulk like Achilles in his tent. According to William Bromley: "Lord Berkshire has been in Town, but is returned again into the Country, as others have done after making their Appearances.

26 House of Lords Record Office. Proxy-book 1685-1733.

27 Longleat House. Thynne Mss., xii, f. 196. Letter dated Overton, 24 Oct. 1711.

28 Jonathan Swift, Journal to Stella, ed. Harold Williams, hereafter cited as Journal to Stella, (Oxford, 1948), ii, 489-490.

Indeed, tho' the Parl. is sitting there is little Occasion for the attendance of the Members of either House, more than are necessary to make an House, for all Proceedings are, & I believe will be, with great Unanimity."²⁹

Despite these weaknesses in mobilising the strength of the Tory party, especially on a regular basis for routine parliamentary business, there is ample evidence to show that occasionally the Tories could organise a full turn-out of their supporters for a crucial debate. When the Tories had a clear majority, as in the first parliament of Anne's reign, there were still those activists, who pressed their Tory friends to attend parliament regularly. Their pleas were usually sent out before the first meeting of the session so that the Tory majority could overawe the Whigs in the initial divisions, and so convince them that regular opposition that session would be useless. Thus in September 1703 Lord Weymouth appealed to James Grahme: "I hope you will muster up all your friends of the Parlt. & particularly desire Sir John Bland not to fail, for nothing is so much hoped for by some men so that they will take pet & not be there. You never yet knew the Whigs throw up the game."³⁰

Before the next session Grahme received a similar letter from John Ward, a virtual Tory 'whip', who asked him to stick to arrangements previously concerted among the Tories: "I saw Mr. Bromley & some other members as I came up, who will observe the agreement at the last general meeting at the

29 Levens Hall Mss., box B, file B 2. To James Grahme, Whitehall, 10 Aug. 1714.

30 Ibid., box E, file W. Letter dated London, 27 Sept. 1703.

Fountain [Tavern] wch was for all to meet there again a full week before the next sitting of the Parliament. This I hope you & your son will also comply with (if you can be spared from your County Election)."³¹

The result of the 1705 election was much closer than that of 1702. At the time no one could be sure which party had a majority. The Tories knew the Court would choose a candidate, who could count on Whig support. The candidate in fact was John Smith, a Whig. Without Court backing the Tories were not sure they could command a majority, but they made every effort to thwart the Court-Whig alliance by securing the election of William Bromley, the leading high-church Tory, as Speaker for the new parliament. Lord Thanet urged James Grahme not to delay his long journey from Westmorland for any reason:

"By yours last post you say you will be in town a week before the meeting of the Parliament in compliance to my desire, but yet mention the choice of a mayor and attendance at sessions which makes it impossible you should be here. If you had mentioned for some other reasons you desired not to be here, it had been more satisfactory to me, but [neither] the choice of mayor nor attendance at sessions are to come in ballance with the choice of a good Speaker, and you have professed such a particular service for Mr. Bromley and not a little for me that some performance on this occasion would prove the greatest kindness you could do yourself. I find by your calculation you conclude Mr. Bromley is sure of it, and so less necessary for you to be here, but by all they [sic] nice calculations, as well by Friends as others, it will be so near that one vote may save or lose it, and I should not be a little troubled if it should be lost by any person that my interest had been employed to promote his being of that assembly."³²

³¹ Ibid. Letter dated Inner Temple, 3 Oct. 1704.

³² Ibid., box D. Letter dated 25 Sept. 1705. In box C, file G there is a letter to the same effect from John Grandorge to Grahme, 25 Sept. 1705.

A week or so later Lord Paget was told that "the High Ch. party amongst us are very confident that Mr. Bromley will be chosen Speaker of the house of Commons, and the Earl of Dysert being last week at Stafford declared in much company that they are assured Mr. Bromley would be chosen, and that 250 members ingaged solemnly to appear the first day of the session and to vote for him. Sir Edw. Bagott who was but last week confined to his bed by the Gout sets out this day towards London."³³

After the 1708 general election, when the Whigs won their only majority of the reign, the Tories planned to display a solid and united front at the opening of the new parliament. Bromley informed Nottingham: "It is the sense of our friends to get a full appearance at the opening of the approaching session upon matters of very great consequence that will then fall under consideration & when they come together to act - according to the encouragements we shall then have."³⁴ The widespread activities of leading Tories, to whip up support and encourage attendance, revealed a national organisation at work. All areas had Tory 'whips', who wrote circular letters to the rank and file Tories. It is unlikely that the display of Tory party organisation was an isolated incident confined to 1708. However, since the evidence of this party operation is more plentiful, it is worth quoting it in detail. It reveals a party organisation more widespread and more efficient than has been generally realised by historians.

33 Mss. of marquess of Anglesey at Plas Newydd. Cited by W. A. Speck, 'The Choice of a Speaker in 1705', Bull.Inst.Hist.Res. (1964), xxxvii, 22.

34 Leicester Record Office. Finch Mss., box vi, bundle 23. Letter dated 2 Oct. 1708.

In the north it appeared to be John Ward's task to encourage attendance at parliament. He wrote to James Grahme: "I have lately corresponded with some of our best friends, who have taken all possible care to inform themselves. [They] conclude there will be some very material points at first opening & agree to press all friends accordingly, & particularly hope you'll not fail one day."³⁵ William Bromley wrote to Sir Justinian Isham, instructing him to rally the midland members:

"Having heard that neither you nor Mr. Cartwright intend to be in Town the first day of the Session, I take the Liberty to desire you will not faile them to be there, & that, if possible, you'll also engage him I have lately seen several of our Friends, & heard from more, who seem determined, if they can get a good appearance to push for a Speaker ... I believe Gentlemen will be solicited from all Parts to come up in the most pressing manner without directly naming the reason for it, least that should alarum, & unite our Enemies."³⁶

Sir Thomas Hanmer, member for Suffolk though formerly for Flintshire, acted as the Tory 'whip' for Wales and the marcher counties. He wrote to Peter Shakerley, member for Chester:

"I have received advice that severall of our Friends have discoursed together concerning ye affairs which are likely to come before ye next Session of Parliamt., and haveing taken ye best Care possible to be well informed they find reason to conclude that some matters of great moment are likely to be offer'd at ye first opening of ye Session. I am desired therefore to acquaint you with this and to request it of you that you woud without fail appear ye first day and also use your endeavours to prevail with all other Members (friends of ours) in yr Neighbourhood to doe

35 Levens Hall Mss., box E, file W. Letter dated 2 Oct. 1708. Ward was M.P. for Newton, Lancashire, and Grahme was M.P. for Westmorland.

36 Northants Record Office. Isham Family Letters 1705. Letter dated Baginton, 15 Oct. 1708. Isham and Cartwright were knights of the shire for Northants.

ye same: you may depend upon it that Care is taken to give ye like notice in all other Places."³⁷

Shakerley informed his brother of the receipt of this letter and asked that the news be sent to their friends in Denbighshire, Flintshire, Caernarvonshire, Carmarthenshire, Merionethshire, Montgomeryshire, Anglesey, and Shropshire. He added: "This day I write to our Friends in Staffordshire and Warwickshire, and shall write tomorrow to those in Lancashire."³⁸ At the same time Sir Roger Mostyn, who had also been contacted by Sir Thomas Hanmer, wrote to Sir Richard Myddelton: "Since the Possibility of doing ye Country any service, depends intirely upon ye good appearance of honest Gentlemen at first; it is most earnestly requested of you, & all such, to be there ye very first day."³⁹ In the south west the Tory manager, George Granville, was asked by Robert Harley, through Sir Simon Harcourt: "to write to all his friends to be in town the first day."⁴⁰

The Tory party, especially during the 1710-14 period, developed a virtual hierarchy of managers and 'whips'. Robert Harley, earl of Oxford, was referred to as the colonel, St. John was the captain, and one of the 'whips' was known as the sergeant and another as Little Arthur; (the last was perhaps Arthur Annesley). Before the 1710 election John Ward told James Grahme: "Little Arthur is very busy from town to town

37 National Library of Wales. Chirk Castle Ms. 994 (1). Letter dated Mildenhall, 21 Oct. 1708.

38 Ibid., 994 (11). To George Shakerley, Hulm, 27 Oct. 1708.

39 Ibid., 995. Letter dated Mostyn, 24 Oct. 1708. Mostyn was member for Flintshire and Myddleton (or Middleton) was member for Denbighshire.

40 H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 192. Harley to Harcourt, 16 Oct. 1708.

debating with the country fellows."⁴¹ Early in 1714 William Bromley advised Grahme: "The session of Parl. will soon be opened, tho' the Queen, God be thanked, being so well, that we have no Reason to fear it will be put off beyond the Time appointed, & I am to tell you the Col. & Capt. desire you & Id Berks[hire] here before that Day. You'l consider this, & will neither stay in the Country yourself, nor keep Lord B. there."⁴² Just before the session opened Sir Thomas Cave informed Lord Fermanagh: "Tomorrow the little Captain and tall Knight set out for North[amp]tonshire"⁴³ The Captain and I are this instant arriv'd at this dusty place, for hearing the Serjeant was taking his Tour to fetch up the Midland Members I was willing to save him the trouble of going Northwards."⁴⁴

Once at Westminster the organisation of the Tory members was even more in evidence. During the parliamentary session large numbers of Tories would meet, usually at the Fountain Tavern or the Vine Tavern, Long Acre, to discuss tactics and policies. In 1705 Thomas Hearne noted in his diary: "On Monday was a meeting of a great number of Loyal Church Parliamt. men at ye Fountain Tavern in the Strand to consider of yeir strength for ye choice of Mr. Bromley to be Speaker."⁴⁵ This was a meeting

41 Levens Hall Mss., box E, file W. Letter dated 16 Sept. 1710.

42 Ibid., box B. Letter dated Whitehall, 21 Jan. 1713/14.

43 Perhaps Sir Thomas Cartwright and Sir Justinian Isham, members for Northants.

44 Buckinghamshire Record Office. Verney Mss. (microfilm). Letters dated 17 Mar. 1714 and London, 13 April 1714.

45 Hearne, i, 58. 25 Oct. 1705.

to debate a specific point, and at this stage the Tories were not as well organised into political clubs as were the Whigs.⁴⁶ After their electoral triumph in 1710, however, the Tories began to replace their irregular and extraordinary gatherings by more permanent political clubs. In November 1710 Lord Fermanagh wrote to his son: "On Monday last about 200 Members met at ye Fountain Tavern in the Strand & I don't know of one Whigg amongst us. We chose Lord Buckley [Bulkeley] to be Steward for ye like meeting next Monday."⁴⁷ The most famous Tory club, the October Club, appeared in this same session. Swift described how it was a club of extreme Tories dissatisfied with the moderation shown towards the Whigs by the chief minister, Robert Harley: "We are plagued here with an October Club, that is, a set of above a hundred parliament-men of the country, who drink October beer at home, and meet every evening at a tavern near the parliament to consult affairs, and drive things on to extreams against the Whigs, to call the old ministry to account, and get off five or six heads."⁴⁸ When the ministers successfully won over some of the October men the remnants formed the March Club.

There were other clubs where Tory politics were diluted with a greater measure of wine. Robert Harley, when he became chief minister,

⁴⁶ See R. J. Allen, The Clubs of Augustan England (Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., 1933), pp. 73-4.

⁴⁷ Buckinghamshire Record Office. Verney Mss. (microfilm). To R. Verney, London, 30 Nov. 1710.

⁴⁸ Journal to Stella, 1, 194-5.

started his Saturday Club for both ministers and friends. Swift took the greatest delight in being a member of this select fraternity. To Stella he wrote: "I went in the evening to see Mr. Harley; and, upon my word, I was in perfect joy. Mr. Secretary [St. John] was just going out of the door; but I made him come back, and there was the old Saturday Club, lord keeper, lord Rivers, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Harley and I."⁴⁹ When St. John began to rival Harley for the leadership of the Tory party he set up his own 'Society'. As befitted his tastes this was as much a literary gathering as a political club, though no doubt he would have wished it to emulate the Whig Kit-Cat Club despite his comment to Lord Orrery:

"We shall begin to meet in a small number, and that will be composed of some who have wit and learning to recommend them; of others who, from their own situations, or from their relations, have power and influence, and of others who, from accidental reasons, may properly be taken in. The first regulation proposed, and that which must be inviolably kept, is decency. None of the extravagance of the kit-cat, none of the drunkenness of the beef-stake is to be endured. The improvement of friendship, and the encouragement of letters, are to be the two great ends of our society. A number of valuable people will be kept in the same mind, and others will be made converts to their opinions."⁵⁰

The last sentence is important. Whatever their other qualities all the members of the 'Society' were to be Tories.⁵¹ Other Tory clubs were even

⁴⁹ Ibid., i, 261.

⁵⁰ Bolingbroke's Corr., i, 246-7. Letter dated 12 June 1711.

⁵¹ Ibid., i, 246 n., gives a list of some of the members, who were all Tories, viz. Swift, Arbuthnot, Prior, Dr. Friend, Lord Arran, Lord Harley, Ormonde, Shrewsbury, Lord Dupplin, Beaufort, Orrery, Bathurst, Jersey, Masham, Sir Robert Raymond, Sir William Wyndham, George Granville, Col. Hill, and Col. Disney. By this time Shrewsbury can be considered a Hanoverian Tory.

more interested in pleasure. One of these was the Board of Brothers, which was primarily a drinking club, though all its members were staunch Tories. Their regular toasts were to the Queen and to the Church. The club met at different taverns, including the Globe, the Star and Garter, and the Queen's Arms. The average meeting was attended by between eight and sixteen members. As well as Tory M.P.s there were Tory peers⁵² and men not in active politics.

During the parliamentary sessions there were frequent meetings among the Tory leaders or between the leaders and the rank and file to concert political action in both houses. John Ward, one of the most diligent Tory managers, told Nottingham: "Whenever it can consist with your Lordship's convenience your presence would give great life to some Lords & other humble servants of your Lordship who daily enquire of your coming. Some met at Lord A's [Abingdon's?] this morning where your Lordship's thoughts were much wanted."⁵³ Before the crucial debate on the

52 The minutes of the club are in B.M.Add.Ms. 49360. Among the Tory peers were Beaufort (president), Denbigh (vice-president), Abingdon, Craven, Hereford, Middleton, Plymouth, and Salisbury. Tory M.P.s included Sir Edmund Bacon, James Barry, Henry Bertie, Lord Bulkeley, James Buller, George Dashwood, Sir Cholmly Deering, William Griffith, Richard Jones, Thomas Logh, Thomas Middleton, Clayton Milburn, Sir George Parker, Alexander Pendarvis, Sir William Pole, Thomas Strangeways and Sir John Walter.

53 Leicester Record Office. Finch Mss., box vi, bundle 23. Letter dated 4 Nov. 1710. During the debate on the conduct of the war in Spain, in the Lords in January 1711, the Tory managers, Argyll, Beaufort, North and Grey, and Scarsdale, visited fellow-peers to whip up support for the attack on the late Whig ministry. Ann Claverling to James Claverling, London, 16 Jan. 1710/11. Durham University Library, Claverling papers.

peace preliminaries, on 7 December 1711, Henry St. John asked Sir George Beaumont, a highly respected Tory 'backbencher', to meet several other friends at the Speaker's house.⁵⁴ Similarly before the 1713 session the lord treasurer concerted measures with prominent Tories.

"The opening of the session being near," he wrote to Lord Guernsey, "and several of your Lordship's friends intending to meet to consider what is proper to be done upon reading the Queen's speech; though, I hope, nothing will be aim'd at, beyond ye common custome of thanks, for I am never for anticipating an approbation, yet on all occasions your Lordship's judgment & weight is of such consequence, that I amongst many other of your friends & servants, desire your Lordship will oblige to come tomorrow, being Monday, at twelve at noon to Lord Dartmouth's House in St. James's Square."⁵⁵

The Tory leaders could inspire support from the rank and file in several ways. The easiest way to achieve this was to appeal to those prejudices that were harboured by the politically naive Tory squires.

Thomas Pitt deliberately warned his son not to follow this type of lead:

"I have been often thinking what box you have gott into in the House of Commons. I am affraid you are one of those children that are awakened with the rattle that is commonly nameing the Church of England, for which noe man have [sic] a greater veneration than myself; but I know it is often named within those walls to bring over a party, the consequence of which has been generally dangerous to the State. And it is the custom of old stagers to make use of such forward fellows as yourselfe, (as the fox did the catt's foot) to trye the temper of the House."⁵⁶

It was just such a policy of appealing to prejudice and emotion that

-
- 54 Bodleian Library. Rawlinson Ms. A286. Letter dated Wednesday night, 5 Dec. 1711.
55 Chatsworth House. Finch papers, box 3, letter 71. Letter dated 8 March 1713.
56 H. M. C., Fortescue Mss., 1, 27. To Robert Pitt, Fort St. George, 6 Feb. 1706/7.

St. John began to adopt in order to seduce the Tories away from Harley's leadership after 1710. To George Clarke he confessed: "I own to you Sir, tho' I have not us'd to be very sanguine, that I begin to reckon upon a clear Tory scheme, more concert & better method. Should we prove so happy, our friends must do their part in making ye administration easy in Parliament."⁵⁷

At a dinner at Arthur Moore's on 11 April 1714 Bolingbroke with several of his friends, including Sir William Wyndham, met a few Tory back-benchers like Sir Edward Knatchbull and Thomas Strangeways. When Knatchbull told Bolingbroke that many Tories were disappointed to see that there were still some Whigs in places, the secretary replied: "If there was one Whig in employment at the rising of this session he would give anyone leave to spit in his face if he would keep his seals two months after the session."⁵⁸ It would be unfair to suggest that this was the level of Tory leadership in Anne's reign. The Tory leaders would also call together their rank and file supporters, explain to them their policy, and impress upon them the need for both discipline and co-operation in parliament. Sir Edward Knatchbull has left a record of one such meeting. This was on 4 April 1714 when the Tory ministry was being severely mauled by the Whig opposition and when Tory morale was flagging because of the internal divisions over the succession problem. Knatchbull noted in his

57 B.M. Egerton Ms. 2618, f. 213. Letter dated Windsor Castle, 19 Dec. 1713.

58 A. N. Newman, 'Proceedings in the House of Commons, March-June 1714', Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. (1961), xxxiv, 214.

diary:

"We had a meeting by summons from Mr. Bromley at his office where Lord T[reasurer], Lord Bolingbroke, Lord Chancellor, the Speaker, and about 30 Gentlemen of the House of Commons when the Lord[s] proposed that we should meet twice a week for a mutual confidence and that the Queen was determined to proceed in the interest of the Church, etc., and my Lord Bolingbroke farther added afterwards that she would not leave a Whig in employ."⁵⁹

The management of the Tories in parliament was the greatest test of party organisation, but it was complicated by the divisions among the Tory leaders. The personal rivalries and the differences in principles and tactics of the Tory leaders need examining to appreciate fully the nature of the Tory party's organisation.

⁵⁹ Ibid. , p. 213.

Chapter Four.

St. John and the Tory Leaders.

When it came to managing their supporters in parliament the Whig leaders formed a splendid team. "The Junto were the most sophisticated, certainly the most persistent, and possibly the most able party-men of their time who constantly and quite openly strove for full party government."¹ The success of the Junto was in large measure due to the ability of these Whig peers to act together. In contrast the leading Tories could not reach agreement either on a personal or on a political level. The first failing, the personal differences, is very difficult to explain. Certainly Rochester was hot-tempered, Nottingham was too fond of striking a moral pose, St. John's ambition was unlimited and Harley was devious and even inscrutable. Yet neither Sunderland's pugnacity nor Orford's churlishness could have made easy the relations of the Junto leaders. It may well have been that, apart from Sunderland, the Junto leaders had many years of co-operation behind them in which to become tolerant of each other's foibles. On the other hand the leading Tories were of different generations and of contrasting political experience. Rochester was a brother-in-law of James II, a former lord

1 E. L. Ellis, 'The Whig Junto in relation to the development of party politics and party organisation, from its inception to 1714', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1962), i, 9. For a recent view of the Tory divisions see Plumb's Political Stability, pp. 153-6.

treasurer to Charles II, and a descendent of a royalist family. Robert Harley was descended from a non-conformist, parliamentary family and for a time under William III had passed as a Whig. Henry St. John was new to politics in 1701 and was more interested in conquering new heights than re-fighting old battles. The political distinctions between the leading Tories are more understandable. It has been emphasised several times that the principles of the Tories did not fit into a neat, coherent whole. Their attitudes to the Church and to the Crown, in particular, frequently pulled them in opposite directions. The Revolution and the question of the succession had created dilemmas, which the Tories had been unable to resolve to general satisfaction. The Tories were on the horns of a dilemma and feared that in tearing themselves free they might inflict yet more serious wounds. Their leaders instead of deciding to cut some of their losses tended to continue to stress their separate views on which way the Tories should jump.

Queen Anne was pro-Tory and her two favourite politicians upon her accession were Godolphin, who became lord treasurer, and Marlborough, who was allowed to command the army. Both men in 1702 would have been considered Tories. They had served James II and after the Revolution they had both merited the distrust of William III. Though they had betrayed James II they conducted a clandestine correspondence with him after 1688. They had not worked with the Whig Junto under William III, but had instead ingratiated themselves with Princess Anne. Nevertheless in Anne's reign it would be misleading to regard them as genuine Tory

leaders. At first they were more willing to work with Tory rather than Whig support, but they were courtiers above all else. Rather than promote the interests of the Tory party they sought to hold office to serve the Queen, and to conduct a successful war. In the early years of the reign their letters are full of complaints against the Tories for pursuing factious policies which embarrassed the Queen's government. By 1703 Marlborough was telling his wife, that, though he would have to vote for the second Occasional Conformity bill so as not to lose the support² of the Tories, he would not persuade anyone else to vote for it. After the scare over the Tack, when it seemed supplies for the war would be held up while the Tories attacked the religious hypocrisy of Whig occasional conformists, Marlborough became completely disillusioned with the Tories. In April 1705 he declared to his wife: "I think at this time it is for the queen's service, and the good of England, that the choice might be such that neither party might have a great majority, so that her majesty might be able to influence what might be good for the common interest." Shortly afterwards, in August 1705, he was writing to his wife: "You sometimes use the expression of my Tory friends. As I never will enter into party and faction, I beg you will have no friends but such as will support the Queen and government."³ Neither Marlborough nor Godolphin could manage the war without party support. Inexorably they were drawn

2 William Coxe, Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough, hereafter cited as Coxe, (2nd ed., London, 1820), 1, 297.

3 Ibid., 11, 233 and 90, respectively.

to the Whigs, who were willing to back the war effort. Swift put Marlborough's motives on a lower level: "He was bred in the height of what is called the Tory Principle, and continued with a strong Bias that way, untill the other Party had bid higher than his Friends could afford to give."⁴ After the 1705 election Marlborough and Godolphin began relying more and more upon Whig support. By 1708 the Whig Junto had begun to force its way into office and Marlborough and Godolphin found themselves tied to the Whig party. When the Tories returned in 1710 both of them began moving in opposition circles, though Marlborough remained commander in chief until the first day of 1712. An examination of the clients and followers of Marlborough and Godolphin confirms that neither of these two leading figures could be considered as Tory leaders. James Craggs senior, who had been employed in the Churchill household and who could be considered a client of Marlborough, voted Whig as early as 1703, on the Lords' amendments to the abjuration oath. An examination of the extant voting lists shows that he voted Whig in 1705, 1706, 1710, twice in 1711, and in 1713. Adam de Cardonnell, Marlborough's secretary, voted Whig in 1706, 1710 and 1711. Sir Thomas Wheate, a client and nominee of Marlborough, voted Whig in 1709, 1710 and 1713. Hugh Boscawen, a nephew of both Marlborough and Godolphin, voted Whig in 1703, 1705, 1706, 1711 and 1714. Francis Godolphin, son of the lord treasurer, tried to

⁴ 'History of the Four Last Years of the Queen', Swift's Prose Works, vii, 7.

defeat a Tacker at Cambridge University in the 1705 election and voted Whig in 1703, 1705, 1706, 1709, 1710, and 1711. Even Admiral George Churchill, Marlborough's brother, who was reckoned to be a firm Tory, never appears on any of the Tory voting lists. In 1705, however, he was persuaded to vote for Smith as Speaker. None of these connections of Marlborough and Godolphin voted on any Tory issue for which a voting list has survived. The same picture could be repeated with other clients and supporters of these two men.⁵

Among the more genuine Tory leaders of Anne's reign there was little cohesion, though three types can be defined; the older generation like Rochester, Nottingham, Sir Christopher Musgrave and Sir Edward Seymour, the rising young Tories like William Bromley and Sir Thomas Hanmer, and the leaders outside the mainstream of Toryism especially Robert Harley and Henry St. John. Since these leaders cannot be considered as a group, as the Whig Junto can, it is important to say something of their personalities and principles. Laurence Hyde, earl of Rochester, was proud, ambitious, and hot-tempered. Roger North stated: "His infirmities were passion, in which

5 Among those connections and clients of Marlborough and Godolphin, who never appear on any of the Tory voting lists but appear on many of the Whig lists, are John Berkeley (Lord Fitzharding), John Churchill, Charles Churchill, Sir Thomas Felton, Robert Furnese, Hugh Fortescue, Sydney Godolphin, Daniel Harvey, Joshua Lomax, Arthur Maynwaring, Thomas Meredith, and Francis Palmes. Among their many followers only Sir Thomas Powys and Samuel Trefusis appear on a Tory list, when in 1710 they both voted for Dr. Sacheverell.

he would swear like a cutter, and the indulging himself in wine."⁶ A son of the great Clarendon, a minister for both Charles II and James II, and an uncle of Queen Anne, he confidently expected to be made lord treasurer in 1702.⁷ He was merely confirmed in his post as lord lieutenant, much to his disgust. Partly from picque and partly from a question of principle he opposed Marlborough's strategy of complete involvement in the continental war. His advocacy of an auxiliary rôle for the British forces and his factious conduct in council and parliament exasperated Marlborough. Within months he was writing to Godolphin: "If 76 [Rochester] shall continue as I am confident they will, of disturbing underhand the publick business, I can't but think but that it will be advisable sooner or later that 79 [the Queen] should take soe much notice as to oblige them to be where their duty calls for them."⁸ When, in 1703, the Queen pressed him to depart for Ireland, he preferred to resign. He did not regain office again until 1710 when he became lord president of the council. By then his ambition was dulled and he was content to accept Harley's leadership. He died in May 1711 before the peace or the protestant succession had become burning issues. Whatever his faults Rochester was capable of great industry and he could be an adroit courtier. In the Lords his knowledge of financial matters was invaluable to a party short of this particular talent. Though he was not a man of the highest political principles he

6 Cited by Feiling, p. 191.

7 Memoirs of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, ed. William King (London, 1930), p. 100.

8 Blenheim Palace Mss. Marlborough papers, AI-14. Letter dated Everbeck, 10/21 Aug. 1702.

always clung to the political and religious teaching of the Church of England. In Anne's reign he supported the Occasional Conformity bills, voted the Church in danger during the debates in 1706, and voted Dr. Sacheverell not guilty in 1710. In the dedication to his father's second volume of The History of the Rebellion, he wrote: "That the Monarchy of England is not now capable of being Supported, but upon the Principles of the Church of England, from whence it will be very natural to conclude, that the preserving them both firmly united together is the likeliest way for your Majesty to Reign happily over Your Subjects."⁹ Rochester was one of the few high Tories to regard a Jacobite restoration as unthinkable. Onslow, a Whig, admitted: "The earl of Rochester, although a very high Tory, was certainly no Jacobite, and always in great credit and esteem at Hanover: at least with the princess Sophia, who upon his death¹⁰ expressed a more than ordinary concern." Rochester had great credit with the Tories and had some personal adherents yet he never managed to be the leader of the Tory party. When he resigned in 1703 he did not lead a party into opposition with him. In 1710 he was no real threat to Harley's leadership. During his whole career he showed no real ability as a party 'manager'. He was perhaps too proud to dabble in routine and petty affairs, and too tactless to coax or flatter the rank and file.

The earl of Nottingham was a man of grave, sober, and pessimistic

⁹ An Essay towards the Life of Lawrence, Earl of Rochester (London, 1711), p. 28.

¹⁰ Burnet, iv, 49 n.

temperament. Though he was a devoted family man, capable of making strong friends, and a keen huntsman, he was not an easy colleague with whom to work. He had rather too much moral rectitude and he was too prone to sententious speeches to attract a large personal following. To protect the interests of the Church of England he deemed to be his primary function in politics. His moral scruples and religious conservatism led him to a lifelong commitment to the defence of the Anglican supremacy. It was he who finally secured the passing of the Occasional Conformity bill. In James II's reign, despite his belief in the royal prerogative, he ranked¹¹ among the opposition. He held aloof from all the negotiations which brought William III to the throne, but he was not averse to serving the new King as secretary of state. As the leading high church peer he decided that the security of the Church of England required him to support the protestant succession. When he opposed the peace preliminaries in December 1711 he became the leading Hanoverian Tory. He could attempt to seduce the Tories away from the ministry by bringing in the Occasional Conformity bill. Yet his attempt to lead a Tory rebellion was a conspicuous failure. In the Lords his brother, Lord Guernsey, was reluctant to side with him. In the Commons his son followed his lead, but not his nephew, Heneage Finch, nor his son-in-law, Sir Roger Mostyn, nor¹² his connections like Sir Charles Hedges, John Sharp, and Lord Barrymore.

¹¹ Feiling, p. 259.

¹² G. S. Holmes, 'The Commons' Division on 'No Peace without Spain', 7 December 1711', Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. (1960), xxxiii, 227.

By 1713 the Hanoverian Tories were a significant section of the Tory party, but Nottingham was not their leader. Though he did not abandon his religious convictions he was never again a leading Tory. When he became lord president of the council under George I he was almost the sole Tory in high office. Earlier in Anne's reign he had been just as unsuccessful as a party leader. Like Rochester he had opposed Marlborough's strategy, but he had wanted to wrest Spain and the West Indies from French control. Unable to persuade either Marlborough or Godolphin he had been manoeuvred into resigning in 1704. In opposition he threatened to be a real danger and Marlborough warned the lord Treasurer:

"I could not leave this place without acquainting you with what has been told me concerning Lord Nottingham; ... I am assur'd he told his Party that the Queen is desirous to doe everything that would give them satisfaction but that she is hindered by you and mee; that he is so convinced that wee shall in a very short time putt all the business into the hands of the Wiggs, that if he can't get such alterations made in the cabinet councell as he thinks absolutely necessary for the safety of the Church he would then quitt and that his opinion was that in the next sessions they should tack to the Land Tax the two bills of occasional conformity."¹³

Nottingham posed a major threat to the ministry, but he lacked the quality of leadership needed to sway the whole Tory party. By superior management, especially by Robert Harley the new secretary of state, the ministers split the Tories. The Tack was eventually supported by less

¹³ Coxe, i, 310. Letter dated Harwich, 8 April 1704.

than half of the Tories in the Commons. If Nottingham could not lead a united Tory party in 1704 he had no chance of leading a major defection in December 1711.¹⁴

In the Commons the first years of Anne's reign saw the end of the political careers of two veteran Tory leaders, Sir Edward Seymour and Sir Christopher Musgrave. Seymour, nicknamed 'Chuffer', had been once 'a wild spark about town' and was always proud, insolent, vindictive, and passionate. He was the embodiment of the country gentleman and shared all the prejudices of the Tory backwoodsmen. He hated popery, the Dutch, Irish cattle, and peers who claimed exemption from acts of parliament. His loyalty to the Anglican Church was unquestioned and perhaps unthinking. As the leader of the south-west he regarded himself as the champion of the landed interest. Despite all his faults he was a great Commoner and a formidable opponent. In Burnet's view:

"The ablest man of his party was Seymour, that was the first Speaker of that House that was not bred to the law. He was a man of great birth and was a graceful man, bold and quick, but was the most immoral and impious man of the age. He had a sort of pride so peculiar to himself that I never say anything like it. He had neither shame nor decency with it. And in all private as well as in public dealings he was the unjustest and blackest man that has lived in our time."¹⁵

To save the Church from the danger of popery Seymour had deserted James II and had joined William III at Exeter in 1688. He deprecated the hurry

¹⁴ The best study of Nottingham is H. G. Horwitz, 'Daniel Finch, Earl of Nottingham', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1963).

¹⁵ Burnet, ii, 72. Cited in English Historical Documents 1660-1714, ed. Andrew Browning, viii, 924.

over the Bill of Rights and began to believe that William too posed a threat to the Church. Yet he took the oaths of allegiance and was never a Jacobite. By 1701 Seymour was approaching the twilight of his career, but when Harley became Speaker he was the leading Tory in the Commons.¹⁶ In the first years of Anne's reign he opposed the moderation of Godolphin and the war strategy of Marlborough. The exasperated general admitted to his wife: "We are bound not to wish for anybody's death but if 14 [Seymour] should die, I am convinced it would be no great loss to the queen nor the nation; and you may be sure the visit intended by 19 [Rochester] and his friend could be for no other end than to flatter 14 to do such mischief as they dare not openly own."¹⁷ In 1704 Seymour was a leading Tacker, but it was almost his last political stand, though he used his electoral interest to good effect in 1705. After a period of illness he died in 1708. Musgrave was "the most fanatical of Tories"¹⁸ and had even traded in poor wretches convicted at the Bloody Assizes. Like Seymour he represented the backwoods squires, this time of the north-west. In temperament and fundamental principles (or prejudices) he resembled Seymour, but he did not always take the same political line. In 1688-9 he had opposed making William and Mary sovereigns and in 1693 he had supported the Triennial bill, which Seymour opposed. The last years of

¹⁶ See Feiling, pp. 142-3, 262, and 348.

¹⁷ Coxe, i, 275. Marlborough to his wife, Hanef, 3/14 June 1703.

¹⁸ Feiling, p. 218.

William's reign saw him among the opposition with Harley and Seymour.¹⁹ Under Anne he was dismayed to be made simply a teller of the exchequer. His Tory prejudices were embarrassing to the ministry and he even opposed the post office grant to Marlborough in 1702.²⁰ Before he could cause real trouble for the ministry he died in 1704. He was a major loss for he may have persuaded the Tories against the blunder of the 'tack'.

The place of Seymour and Musgrave in the Tory hierarchy in the Commons was taken by William Bromley and Sir Thomas Hanmer. These two men represented a new generation of Toryism, free from the traumatic experience of the Revolution. While they shared some of the principles of Seymour and Musgrave they were not so prejudiced nor so fanatical as either of them. Both Bromley and Hanmer were prosperous gentry, connected to the aristocracy. Hanmer had married the dowager duchess of Grafton and Bromley had married a daughter of Lord Stawell. They both laid greater stress on their devotion to the Church of England than on their loyalty to the Crown. Throughout Anne's reign Bromley represented Oxford University and it was he who introduced all three Occasional Conformity bills in the first parliament of the reign. In 1704 he was the leader of the Tackers. After the election of 1705 he was the acknowledged leader of the high Tories and the Tory candidate for Speaker. He could not be seduced by the Court and from 1704-8 he led the Tory opposition in the Commons. Though he naturally bore the brunt of Whig

19 Ibid., pp. 290-1.

20 Coxe, i, 207.

slander in these years he seems to emerge as one of the few party leaders with great integrity and a constant devotion to political principles.

Thomas King was not exaggerating too much when he wrote:

"As to wt you enquire of Mr. Bromley he is a person of as great abilitys, integrity, vertue & piety as any in ye nation. Those who oppos'd him in ye House had nothing to object agt. him but for being a Tacker & those yt know him would be asham'd (if a whigg can be soe) to say any of these things you are told of him I am sorry yt a gentleman of his extraordinary worth should be soe traduc'd, but such aspersions as these are ye artifices of ye party & they are sent to their emissarys in ye country who are strangers to his character & great desert. I am confident yt noe sober person yt knows him will say otherwayes of him than wt I have writt."²¹

Bromley clearly had some ability as a party leader since he led the Tory party for several years, at least in the Commons. Yet after Robert Harley had resigned as secretary of state in 1708 and had silenced Bromley's doubts as to his loyalty to Tory principles Bromley relinquished his leadership. By 1710 Bromley was merely a loyal lieutenant, though an important one, of Robert Harley. When the Tories split in the last years of Anne's reign and several would-be party leaders emerged Bromley was not one of them. He remained loyal to Harley and to the protestant succession. This suggests that his leadership of the Tories earlier in the reign had been based more on personal integrity and sincerity of principle than on the ability to 'manage' and organise a party. Sir Thomas Hanmer, too, became a Tory leader almost in spite of himself. He shared many of Bromley's virtues and he showed a genuine reluctance to take office in case

21 B.M.Add.Ms. 4276, f. 15. To George Plaxton, 10 Nov. 1705.

he should be suspected of compromising his principles. A natural 'country' Tory, though a great orator, he resisted all the blandishments of the Tory ministers after 1710. It was not until 1713 that he agreed to accept the Speakership, but this was after he had clearly shown his independence by leading the successful Tory revolt against the commercial treaty with France. His religious scruples and his attachment to the Anglican supremacy were offended by the equivocal attitude of the ministers towards the succession. Without any real personal ambition to take the rôle of a party leader he became the principal Hanoverian Tory in the Commons. He never went so far as Nottingham, who was now working regularly with the Whig opposition. He probably hoped the whole Tory party would see that its best interests lay in accepting the Hanoverian succession.

There were other prominent Tories, who, though never aspiring to lead the party, played an important rôle in Anne's reign. The Tory party lacked leaders with the varied specialist talents of the Junto, but they were not entirely lacking men with particular talents. As we have seen, Rochester was one of the few Tories with experience at the treasury, Nottingham knew a great deal about foreign affairs, and Seymour was an expert in parliamentary affairs. In the second rank there were men like Haversham, with an expert knowledge of naval affairs, and Beaufort, the only Tory with an electoral interest, in Monmouth, Gloucester, and South Wales, to rival Newcastle's and Wharton's. In legal matters the Tories could call upon the talents of Sir Simon Harcourt. Onslow did not like Harcourt, but he admitted that, as lord chancellor, he was honest and "he

had the greatest skill and power of speech of any man I ever knew, in a public assembly."²² It is an important fact that the Tories were rich in orators if not in other talents. Nottingham, though a little long-winded, was judged a fine speaker, Haversham could sell copies of his speeches, and both Hammer and St. John were in the very first rank as speakers. To some extent the oratory of the Tories made up for their poorer discipline. The Tories, however, did possess some hard-working debaters and managers to compare with Walpole, Jekyll, King, Lechmere, and Stanhope in the Whig ranks. In almost every division, even on quite minor issues, the Tories were represented by active members, who were almost the equivalent of party whips; men like Charles Caesar, Henry Campion, Ralph Freeman, Sir John Pakington, Peter Shakerley, and John Ward. It was these Tories of the second rank who made the party formidable even when numerically inferior.

Whatever the abilities and achievements of these Tory leaders, whether of the old or new generation, the fortunes of the Tory party in Anne's reign were shaped more by the careers of two men who do not easily fit into the mainstream of Toryism, Robert Harley and Henry St. John. Harley was the most able and the most devious politician of the age. A man of sincere religious and moral principles, a devoted family man, and a convivial companion, he nevertheless won an unenviable reputation for intrigue and deception. He was universally known as 'Robin the Trickster'.

22 Burnet, v, 441 n.

Lord chancellor Cowper once referred to "that humour of his, which was, never to deal clearly or openly, but always with Reserve, if not Dissimulation, or rather Simulation; & to love Tricks even where not necessary, but from an inward Satisfaction he took in applauding his own Cunning. If any Man was ever born under a Necessity of being a Knave, he was."²³ Even his friends admitted to this fault in his manner and they also complained of his procrastination, his moderation even in the heat of party strife, and his attempt to control all business himself. Swift wrote of him: "He had an Air of Secrecy in his Manner and Countenance, by no means proper for a great Minister, because it warns all Men to prepare against it. He often gave no Answer at all, and very seldom a direct one ... Another of his Imperfections universally known and complained of, was Procrastination or Delay; which was doubtless naturall to him." It was attested "that he had acted a trimming Part; was never thorowly in the Interest of the Church, but held separate Commerce with the Adverse Party That he undertook more Business than he was equall to, affected a Monopoly of Power and would concert nothing with the rest of the Ministers."²⁴ It was these personal faults rather than any lack of political acumen that caused his fall in July 1714.

Under William III Harley had at first acted with the Whigs, but

23 Private Diary of William, first Earl Cowper, ed. E.C. Hawtrey (Roxburghe Club, 1833), p. 33.

24 'An Enquiry into the Behaviour of the Queen's Last Ministry', Swift's Prose Works, viii, 137-140. Cf. 'Some free Thoughts upon the present State of Affairs', ibid., viii, 80-83.

within a few years he was leading the country opposition to the Junto. The King had been forced to attempt a compromise and in 1701 Harley became Speaker for the first time. Under Anne he was one of the court politicians - he was only out of office 1708-10 - anxious to build a majority around the Court itself. A far more subtle and skilful politician than Godolphin he is now attracting considerable attention from historians. One current explanation of his policy is that he tried to persuade both moderate Whigs and Tories to support the Court, in order to destroy the parties themselves by leaving them as extremist minorities. "Harley hoped that by capturing men of this type [the moderates] he would be able to smash both Whigs and Tories, and set up a scheme of non-party government drawing its strength from dissidents, moderates and independents."²⁵ It is true that Harley wished to prevent party extremists controlling policy, but he realised that the parties were a fact of political life and that no ministry could depend solely on 'Queen's servants' and moderates. His plan was to work with the parties, but without capitulating to either. Though party support might be bought by places the party leaders should not be allowed to dictate policy. The influential positions were to remain in the hands of those the Court could trust. In The Englishman Steele wrote:

25 Angus McInnes, 'The Political Ideas of Robert Harley', History (Oct. 1965), L, no. 170, p. 314. Harley's dream "was of a middle party based on a thorough exploitation of patronage. He wished to see jobs going to men pliant enough to allow events to dictate policies." Plumb's Political Stability, p. 153.

Harley's plan "was to put one Man into the Appearance of Business, and another into the Execution of it. We shall take the liberty to say, that Mr. Prior carry'd on the Negociation in France, while a Man of Greater Quality had the Character of it: That Tom Harley was the Great Manager at Utrecht, while we had a Noble Lord Spiritual and another Temporal, Ambassadors for the Treaty: That Mr. Gillingham did all Things of Consequence in Spain, while a Peer of England stalked about the Spanish Court."²⁶

In Anne's reign Harley was prepared to work with both Whigs and Tories, though in 1708 he fought unsuccessfully to keep the Whig Junto out of office and after 1710 he resisted the attempts of the October Club to dictate government policy. In 1705 Harley had tried to describe his political aims in a letter to William Stratford: "I took up my principles not to lay them down because they please not the factions & humorsome. I have for twelve years past & more every session had the ill word of both parties as they were mad in their Turnes. I must therefore still persist to do them good against their will."²⁷ Yet he can still be regarded as a moderate Tory. He knew that the majority of the nation was Tory and that the Queen herself favoured the Tories. Therefore it was from the position of a Court Tory that he wished to lead or at least to 'manage'.

In the early years of Anne's reign the Marlborough-Godolphin ministry depended upon Harley's control of the Commons. Godolphin wrote

²⁶ No. 5, 25 July 1715. The Englishman, ed. Rae Blanchard (Oxford, 1955), p. 270.

²⁷ B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/171/2. Letter dated 10 Oct. 1705.

regular notes to Harley pleading with him to control the unruly elements among the Tory party. In one such letter he wrote:

"I think there shd bee a meeting of the Gentlemen of the H. of Comons to Concert what shd bee done next day about the Aylesbury business, & about making the recruits & getting the 5000 men, and it may not be amiss also to think of what shall bee sayd about the business of Scotland upon wch I find by Mr. Secty Hedges the Angry Gentlemen are very keen Some measures shd bee speedily concerted to Continue our present majority to the end of this parliament wch might also lay a foundation of having one of the same kind in the next."²⁸

On another occasion he suggested: "I can at present think of nothing more, but that Mr. Sec^{ty} Hedges & you wd please to summon for tomorrow night after the Cab[inet] Councill the Gentlemen of ye House of Commons who usually meet at his house & Mr. Churchill particularly shd bee there, where they may concert who shd more be spoken to & by whom & what is there resolved may bee putt in practice the next day."²⁹ When the Tory extremists threatened to hamper the prosecution of the war by planning to tack the Occasional Conformity bill to the land tax, Harley's skill was put to the test. It was not found wanting. He quickly made a list of eighty-eight Tories, who might be tempted to join the hard core extremists over the Tack. Harley then saw to it that all the M.P.s on his list were visited either by himself, by one of the ministry like Godolphin or Sir Charles Hedges, or by one of his personal adherents like Thomas Foley and

²⁸ Longleat House. Portland papers, misc. mss. A volume of letters from Godolphin to Harley, ff. 132-3. Letter dated 'Fryday night at 8'.

²⁹ Ibid., f. 196. Letter dated 'Sat. at noon' [25 Nov. 1704?].

Thomas Mansell. No less than sixty of these listed Tories were dissuaded from voting for the Tack.³⁰ Six years later, when Harley was chief minister, he faced a similar threat from the Tory extremists of the October Club. He again showed his political gifts. By making a few concessions and infiltrating the club with his own supporters he drew the teeth of the October men. When he was stabbed by Guiscard his enforced absence showed that there was no parliamentary manager able to step immediately into his shoes. When his health began to fail and Bolingbroke challenged his leadership both the Queen and the Tories found there was no one who could really take his place.

Few men have been studied more but understood less than Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke. He has suffered at the hands of those writers who have written of other aspects, or concentrated on other personalities, of the age in which he lived. In one of his purple passages Winston Churchill, anxious to defend his ancestor, the duke of Marlborough, dismissed St. John as an "unpurposed, unprincipled, miscreant adventurer."³¹ Louis Kronenberger was even more vehement in his denunciation: "He had neither moral stamina nor intellectual honesty nor emotional benevolence; and as he was in his heart, so was he in his dealings

30 P. M. Anstell, 'Harley's Parliamentary Management', Bull.Inst.Hist.Res. (1961), xxxiv, 92-97.

31 W. S. Churchill, Marlborough: His Life and Times, hereafter cited as Churchill, (London, 1938), iv, 619.

with men. In short he was a scoundrel."³² In his biographers St. John has suffered almost as badly. Walter Sichel, who wrote two large volumes covering his whole career, fell into the obvious trap of being "excessively adulatory".³³ Sir Charles Petrie and Sir Douglas Harkness concentrated almost exclusively on his early career and the latter in particular made no pretence at original research. The older works by Cooke and Macknight have been largely invalidated by the discovery of much new manuscript material and by new interpretations of eighteenth-century politics. Three recent works are really only studies of different aspects of his political philosophy and his published works, rather than on his political career.³⁴ Moreover only one of all these works has been written by a professional historian,³⁵ and even this study was based solely

32 Louis Kronenberger, Kings and Desperate Men (London, 1942), p. 26. Cf. John Morley's remark: "Of all the characters in our history, Bolingbroke must be pronounced to be most of a charlatan." Walpole (London, 1893), pp. 79-80.

33 J. H. Plumb, Sir Robert Walpole (London, 1956), i, 130 n.

34 The three recent works are Jeffrey Hart, Viscount Bolingbroke, Tory Humanist (London, 1965), Sydney Wayne Jackman, Man of Mercury (London, 1965), and Harvey C. Mansfield, Statesmanship and Party Government (Chicago, 1965). The older works referred to are Walter Sichel, Bolingbroke and his Times (London, 1901), 2 vols., Sir Charles Petrie, Bolingbroke (London, 1937), Sir Douglas Harkness, Bolingbroke: The Man and his Career (London, 1957), G. W. Cooke, Memoirs of Lord Bolingbroke (London, 1835), 2 vols., and Thomas Macknight, The Life of Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke (London, 1863).

35 Sydney Wayne Jackman, a professor of history in Canada, whose work, Man of Mercury, is sub-titled, 'An Appreciation of the Mind of Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke', and is a series of essays on Bolingbroke's published works.

on printed sources. In many instances mistakes made by early biographers have been accepted uncritically by later writers on Bolingbroke.³⁶ Apart from the factual errors most writers on Bolingbroke try to interpret his character as a constant, unchanging factor, while asserting that his career showed remarkable changes in fortune and circumstance. G. M. Trevelyan, in an edition of Bolingbroke's Letters on the Study and Use of History, warned that "the reader must remember that he is reading the words not of the Henry St. John of 1710-12, but of the Bolingbroke of 1735-6, a man chastened by long years of proscription and exile, trying to recover by his pen what he had lost by his actions."³⁷ The following appraisal of St. John will be restricted to his early career. A 'character study' of St. John will help, with a narrative study of his early political career, to build up a more coherent picture of the young Bolingbroke.

Henry St. John's political career in Anne's reign will never be understood until his personality and character have been studied.

36 An anonymous reviewer of the three studies published in 1965 wrote, "Any attentive reader of Bolingbroke biographies could continue playing this game of watch-the-error-travel quite easily for himself." The Times Literary Supplement, 12 May 1965. Cf. H. G. Pitt's review in the New Statesman, 1 July 1966: "No one has yet been found who can assess his career as a whole So he is relegated to a biography a decade from those authors who are drawn by riddles, enigmas and blasted hopes as moths to a flame."

37 Bolingbroke's Defence of the Treaty of Utrecht, with an introduction by G. M. Trevelyan (Cambridge, 1932), p. x.

Naturally the formative years of his childhood and youth helped to mould the enigmatic politician of later years. Unfortunately there is surprisingly little known about his first twenty years, though this has not prevented writers making quite definite, and frequently erroneous statements about St. John's early life. However, what can be tentatively pieced together suggests that St. John had an unusual background and education; a fact which might go far to explain his lack of fixed principles and the suspicion with which he was regarded by many people. In his early years St. John lacked a stable, integrated family background and was subject to conflicting pressures. The branches of the St. John family had been severed by the Civil War, though two of the younger lines had been reunited by the marriage of his paternal grandparents. Sir Walter St. John, of a cavalier branch, married Johanna St. John, daughter of Cromwell's Lord Chief Justice. Yet the marriage apparently did not solve the religious differences. Sir Walter St. John was always a conforming member of the Church of England and endowed the charity school at Battersea, which still bears his name. Lady Johanna remained a puritan and reputed to be a patroness of the non-conformist divines, Daniel Burgess and Dr. Thomas Manton. Their son, Henry St. John senior, appears to have been a typically restoration rake, at least in his earlier years. Having killed Sir William Estcourt in a tavern brawl he had to secure Charles II's pardon by means of a large bribe. His son, Henry St. John, the future Lord Bolingbroke, had the further misfortune to lose his mother, Mary Rich, a daughter of the earl of Warwick, shortly

after his birth.³⁸ Deprived of a mother, with an unreliable father, and born into a family with divided religious, moral, and political principles it is not altogether surprising that St. John exhibited a fundamental instability throughout his career.

He was born on 16 September 1678³⁹, and not on 1 October as nearly all of his biographers have asserted. It also seems likely that he was born at Lydiard Tregoze in Wiltshire, where his mother was buried on 2 October,⁴⁰ though he was later baptised at Battersea, the home of his paternal grandparents. His biographers have generally assumed, with little evidence, that he was educated by his grandparents, and to this end Lady Johanna employed Daniel Burgess and Dr. Thomas Manton. Certainly in later years Bolingbroke claimed that he had been compelled to spend many weary hours studying the latter's works. In a letter to Swift he wrote: "I resolve to make my letter at least as long as one of your sermons; and, if you do not mend, my next shall be as long as one of Dr. Manton's, who taught my youth to yawn, and prepared me to be a High-Churchman, that I might never hear him read, nor read him more."⁴¹ Dr. Manton could never have been his tutor for he died in 1677, a year before St. John's birth.

38 Lady Mary Hopkinson, Married to Mercury (London, 1936), p. 16.

39 Ibid., p. 16. See also B.M. Egerton Ms. 2378, f. 37.

40 Frank T. Smallwood, 'Bolingbroke's Birthplace', The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine (1965), vol. 60, pp. 96-99.

41 The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, ed. F. Elrington Ball (London, 1910), hereafter cited as Swift's Corr., iii, 92-3. Bolingbroke to Swift, 21 July 1721 n.s.

Nor is it certain that Burgess was tutor to the young Henry St. John.⁴²

It has also been the common practice to assert that St. John was educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford. There is little evidence for either claim. His name does not appear on any list or register at Eton. The evidence of Horace Walpole, that Bolingbroke and Walpole "had set out rivals at Eton",⁴³ is unreliable. Not only was Horace Walpole prejudiced, and writing years afterwards, but Robert Walpole was two years older than Henry St. John, and he was unlikely to have been his schoolboy rival. However, Bolingbroke himself claimed to have been educated at Eton. In 1717 he wrote to his father: "Yr sending ye eldest of yr two Sons to Eaton makes me hope yt his health is mended. It is late for him to go thither unless he has been instructed according to ye method of yt school. I remember the pain it cost me to fall into yt method, & to overtake those in points of form, who were behind me in knowledge of ye Latin tongue."⁴⁴ In the absence of any evidence to the contrary it must

⁴² The Dictionary of National Biography, under Burgess, makes the strange claim that Burgess was employed by the countess of Warwick, a kinswoman of his mother's, to act as St. John's tutor.

⁴³ Memoirs of the Last Ten Years of the Reign of George the Second (London, 1822), i, 195.

⁴⁴ B.M.Add.Ms. 34196, f. 2 v. Letter dated 24 July 1717. Jeffrey Hart, Viscount Bolingbroke, Tory Humanist, p. 22, thought this letter was addressed to Bolingbroke's half-sister, Henrietta, but she was not even married at this time. For no very clear reason W. Sichel, Bolingbroke and his Times, ii, 481 and Sir Douglas Harkness, Bolingbroke: The Man and his Career, p. 17, thought it was addressed to Lord Harcourt. I am grateful to Mr. Frank T. Smallwood, formerly of Sir Walter St. John school, for showing me that the letter was most probably addressed to St. John's father, and referred to the education of his two younger sons by his second marriage. Mr. Smallwood has also given me much invaluable advice on St. John's early life and education. This letter may well just refer to the 'Eton' as distinct from the 'Winchester' method of teaching Latin.

be supposed that he spent some time at Eton. But there is no evidence whatsoever that St. John went to Christ Church, Oxford. Not only is his name not on any register there, but the only evidence that has been cited to suggest that he was a student there is a single remark, in a letter to the duke of Shrewsbury on 3 December 1713, that "as to Dr. Freind, I have known him long, and cannot be without some partiality for him, since he was of Christ Church."⁴⁵ This can be explained by the fact that in August 1702 St. John had had an honorary degree conferred on him at Christ Church, no doubt because of his early services to the Tory party. Rather than enjoying such a high church education it is possible that St. John went instead to a Dissenting Academy. His grandmother, Lady Johanna, may have employed a Dissenting tutor, if not Burgess. When St. John's father remarried in 1687 he may have resumed his parental responsibilities and, it is interesting to note, his second wife, Angelica Pelissary, came from a French-Swiss family which practised the Huguenot faith.⁴⁶ Either St. John's grandmother or step-mother could have arranged for him to go to a Dissenting Academy. On the authority of a manuscript account in Dr. Williams' Library, Joshua Toulmin listed St. John as one of the pupils at Sheriffhales Academy.⁴⁷ It has also been suggested that when Lord

⁴⁵ Bolingbroke's Corr., iv, 381.

⁴⁶ Although she became an occasional conformist she appears to have kept her Huguenot faith. In his will her husband left £50 to the poor of the French Church of the Savoy.

⁴⁷ Joshua Toulmin, An Historical View of the State of the Protestant Dissenters in England (London, 1814), app. v, p. 559. Unfortunately Toulmin also claimed that Robert Harley was educated at Sheriffhales and this was proved inaccurate by A.J.D.M. McInnes, 'Robert Harley, Secretary of State', unpublished Wales M.A. thesis (1961), pp. 170-172.

Wharton opposed the Schism bill in 1714, saying, that "he could not but wonder, that persons who had been educated in dissenting academies, whom he could point at, and whose tutors he could name, should appear the most forward in suppressing them,"⁴⁸ that he had in mind Robert Harley and Henry St. John.⁴⁹ Though the evidence is not conclusive it is far more substantial than that which supports the theory of an Oxford University education. In fact the evidence for St. John's early life does not become substantial until 1698 when he was on a tour of Europe, in the course of which he visited France, Switzerland, and Italy before 1700. During this tour he showed those inconsistencies of character and principle, which were probably the result of his family and educational upbringing. He made friends with Whigs like James Stanhope⁵⁰ and Edward Hopkins,⁵¹ yet corresponded with the Tory, Sir William Trumbull.⁵² Though he enjoyed the

⁴⁸ William Cobbett's Parliamentary History, vi, 1352.

⁴⁹ G. W. Cooke, Memoirs of Lord Bolingbroke, i, 8, and G. M. Trevelyan, Queen Anne, iii, 282. Bonet, the Prussian resident, explained to the Berlin Court, in a letter sent on 11 June 1714, that Wharton had alluded specifically to the education of Harley and Lord Harcourt in Dissenting Academies, but only generally to St. John's dissenting ancestors. Prussian Mss. No. 39 a, f. 143. One newsletter claimed that Wharton said that the greatest figure in the state and the author of the peace had been educated at a Dissenting seminary. Wentworth Papers, p. 385. This could be a reference to Oxford or Bolingbroke.

⁵⁰ Basil Williams, Stanhope (Oxford, 1932), pp. 18-19.

⁵¹ M. D. Harris, 'Memoirs of the Right Hon. Edward Hopkins, M.P. for Coventry', E.H.R. (1919), xxxiv, 498.

⁵² H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 777 et seq.

pleasures of a young rake his letters show that he took a great interest in politics and religion. On his return to England he was able to succeed to the family parliamentary seat at Wootton Bassett, Wiltshire, for which he was elected in February 1701. He had no hesitation in aligning himself with the Tory opposition to William III's Whig ministers, in spite of his earlier connections with Dissenters. Whilst he soon became prominent among the high church Tories there is no real evidence to suggest that he shared their personal religious convictions. In later life he was a well-known Deist. It may well be that his ambition led him to join a party which had the support of the majority of the political nation and which, paradoxically, was short of talented leaders.

More than his talents or his achievements it was St. John's personality that impressed contemporaries and his character which has intrigued historians. Swift, who appreciated the skill and moderation of Robert Harley, earl of Oxford, and who was alarmed at some of St. John's qualities, was still captivated by the latter: "The Secrty is much the greatest Commoner in Engld., and turns the whole Parlmt., who can do nothing without him, and if he lives & has his health, will I believe be one day at the Head of Affairs. I have told him sometimes, that if I were a dozen years younger, I would cultivate his Favor, and trust my Fortune with his."⁵³ Lord Chesterfield has left probably the best appreciation of St. John's character:

⁵³ Journal to Stella, ii, 495.

"He has been a most mortifying instance of the violence of human passions, and of the weakness of the most exalted human reason. His virtues and his vices, his reason and his passions, did not blend themselves by a gradation of tints, but formed a shining and sudden contrast. Here the darkest, there the most splendid colours; and both rendered more striking from their proximity."⁵⁴

Later writers have gained a similar impression of the striking contrast between his virtues and his vices. Walter Bagehot commented that "with many splendid gifts, he was exceedingly defective in cool and plain judgment,"⁵⁵ while Dr. J. H. Plumb believed that "for a politician, there was a fatal lack of integration between his personal life and his political attitude."⁵⁶ Indeed St. John himself seems to have been aware of his own psychological make-up. His professed models were Alcibiades and Petronius, while even during his early career he had merited the nicknames of Man of Mercury or Mercurialis, the Thracian, and the Captain; suggesting a combination of instability and vitality.

The aspect of St. John's character, which attracted most contemporary comment, was his flagrant debauchery. We need not be deterred by Walter Sichel's conclusion that there is little evidence for his life of pleasure or that St. John was no more of a libertine than most

54 The Letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope, fourth Earl of Chesterfield, ed. Bonamy Dobree (London, 1932), hereafter cited as Chesterfield's Letters, iv, 1462. To his son, London, 12 Dec. 1749.

55 'Bolingbroke as a Statesman', in The Works and Life of Walter Bagehot, ed. Mrs. Russell Barrington (London, 1915), iv, 164.

56 Sir Robert Walpole, i, 130.

of his contemporaries;⁵⁷ we need only quote St. John himself. His remarks to his fellow-rakes, Thomas Coke and Thomas Erle, justify the legend: "As to whores, dear friend," he wrote to Coke, "I am very unable to help thee. I have heard of a certain housemaid that is very handsome: if she can be got ready against your arrival, she shall serve for your first meal Really, Tom, you are missed: whoring flags without you."⁵⁸ To General Erle he once wrote: "I got to Town last night early, writ my Letters, lay with my Mistress, and after nine hours continued sleep, find myself in perfect health, so that I discover with great joy in yr humble servant a Constitution fit for one that is Secretary to so many Rakes."⁵⁹ It appears that St. John took a positive delight in displaying to the world that he could live a life of pleasure while also succeeding in public affairs. He wished to excel in every sphere and craved admiration for every facet of his nature and ability. This often led to accusations of affectation in the most obvious form. Count Gallas, the Austrian envoy, who was an hostile critic, reported: "He is given to the bottle and debauchery to the point of almost making a virtue out of his open affectation that public affairs are a bagatelle to him, and that his capacity is on so high a level that he has no need to give up his pleasures in the slightest degree for any cause."⁶⁰ Even Swift, a friendly witness,

⁵⁷ Bolingbroke and his Times, i, 159.

⁵⁸ H.M.C., Cowper Mss., iii, 49 and 61. Letters dated 16 Oct. 1704 and 28 May 1705.

⁵⁹ Charborough Park. Erle papers. Letter dated Whitehall, 31 July 1706.

⁶⁰ Translated and cited by Churchill, iv, 478. Gallas's report to the Emperor, 17 July 1711.

admitted: "His only fault is talking to his friends in way of complaint of too great a load of business, which looks a little like affectation; and he endeavours too much to mix the fine gentleman, and man of pleasure with the man of business."⁶¹

In his frequent declarations of his love of learning and of study St. John has also been suspected of striking a flattering pose. Contemporaries were sceptical of the ambitious politician, who, bitterly frustrated at his inability to find a seat in the 1708-10 parliament, could still declare: "If I continue in the country, the sports of the field & the pleasures of my study will take up all my thoughts, & serve to amuse me as long as I live."⁶² Most historians have also agreed that in his later career St. John pursued his various studies only because he was debarred from an active political career. This appears indisputable, yet it would be unfair to deny that St. John was attracted by learning and literary pursuits throughout his life. His early letters to Sir William Trumbull contain frequent references to his study of civil law and Latin classics. During his European tour he acquired such a command of French that in the peace negotiations leading to the treaty of Utrecht he surprised and impressed Torcy and the French Court. At that time he had not been abroad for ten years; which argues either a phenomenal memory or continued study. As a young man he contributed a poem to the preface of

⁶¹ Journal to Stella, ii, 401.

⁶² Bodleian Library. English Ms., Misc. E. 180, f. 6. To Lord Orrery, Bucklebury, 1 Sept. 1709.

Dryden's translation of the works of Virgil. This was followed by other attempts at verse; Almahide - an ode, To Miss Clara A—— s, and the prologues to George Granville's play Heroick Love and Charles Boyle's revision of The General.⁶³ Though these are poor efforts, far better forgotten, St. John never abandoned his taste for writing. In 1710 he wrote A Letter to the Examiner, which was virtually that newspaper's manifesto, and he also appears to have helped Swift with his great pamphlet, The Conduct of the Allies.⁶⁴ He discovered in himself a genuine talent for political journalism, an ability which was to blossom forth in his contributions to The Craftsman. Throughout his life St. John was at the centre of a literary coterie and he delighted in the company of Swift, Pope, Voltaire and others. When he formed his 'Society' in 1711 he invited men of wit and learning to join.⁶⁵ In all this there was a degree of affectation, a wish to excel and a desire to be admired by men of talent, but it is not impossible to accept St. John's later claim: "This love and this desire [of study] I have felt all my life, and I am not quite a stranger to this industry and application Reflection had often its turn, and the love of study and the desire of knowledge have never quite abandoned me."⁶⁶

63 See G. W. Cooke, Memoirs of Lord Bolingbroke, ii, app. i, 285-299 and G. G. Barber, 'A Bibliography of Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke', unpublished Oxford B.Litt. thesis (1963).

64 Journal to Stella, ii, 397.

65 Bolingbroke's Corr., i, 246-7. Swift, Prior, Arbuthnot, and Dr. Friend were all members.

66 'The True Use of Retirement and Study', included in Letters on the Study and Use of History (London, 1770 edition), pp. 414-5.

Affectation is a harmless enough flaw, but in St. John's case it seemed a manifestation of temperamental instability. In fact in St. John there appears to have been a struggle between his mind and his temperament, a clash between his intellect and his passions. He had a cool, rational intelligence and a fierce, unbridled nature. He always wished to display the former but was more often betrayed by the latter. Tense, sensitive, highly-strung, he reacted violently to criticism and came near to panic in a crisis. He bitterly resented that his achievements in the difficult peace negotiations with France were not recognised by an earldom⁶⁷, and in later life he could hardly bear Warburton's criticism of his writings.⁶⁸ In 1711 when Guiscard stabbed Harley, the latter remained calm while St. John joined in the general panic.⁶⁹ In the more serious crisis following the death of Queen Anne he clearly lost his nerve. Unable to face the malice of the Whigs he fled secretly to France in 1715. This contrasted ill with the composure of his rival Robert Harley, earl of Oxford. At times St. John could recognise his emotional moods. To Sir William Trumbull he once confessed: "I have no very great stock of philosophy, and am far from being a Stoic. Pain to me is pain, and pleasure pleasure."⁷⁰ Despite his restless

67 A Letter to Sir William Windham (London, 1753), p. 31.

68 T. Macknight, The Life of Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, p. 682.

69 See my article, 'The attempt to assassinate Harley, 1711', History Today (Nov. 1965), p. 791.

70 H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 810. Letter dated London, 31 Oct. 1701.

ambition he could still claim, and moreover could convince himself:

"Whether it is owing to a constitution or to Philosophy I can't tell, but certain it is, that I can make myself easy in any sort of life."⁷¹

When all his hopes were dashed in August 1714 he could still attempt philosophic indifference: "The Earl of Oxford was removed on Tuesday; the Queen died on Sunday. What a world is this, and how does Fortune banter us."⁷² Nevertheless the same remark fails to conceal his great disappointment. It is symptomatic of the contrast, and indeed the struggle, between what he hoped to feel and how he actually felt.

A frequent charge levelled against St. John is that his immorality extended to a readiness to betray his friends to serve his own ambition and passion. There is, of course, some justification for this view. Particularly reprehensible was his coarse treatment of his first wife, Frances Winchescomb. Though it was a marriage of convenience⁷³ his wife appeared to have been faithful and devoted to him even in his worst days in 1715. In contrast St. John showed her little, if any, consideration. His conduct so offended the Queen⁷⁴ that, too late, St. John tried to assume a devotion to his wife so as "to answer

71 Bodleian Library. English Mss., Misc. E. 180, f. 6. To Lord Orrery, Bucklebury, 1 Sept. 1709.

72 Swift's Corr., ii, 214. To Swift, 3 Aug. 1714.

73 See H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 802. St. John to Trumbull, 26 May 1701.

74 See Original Papers, ed. James Macpherson (London, 1775), ii, 532.

objections in the world, and that somebody may with a better grace confide in him."⁷⁵ St. John has also been accused of similar baseness in the manner by which he repaid the affection of Marlborough, Harley and Pope. In these instances some defence can be offered. St. John never wished for a personal breach with Marlborough and even during the negotiations for peace in 1711 he tried to remain on friendly terms with the general.⁷⁶ The rift appeared only after it became a question of Marlborough's dismissal or a continuation of the exhausting war with France. In later life he could write of Marlborough: "I take with pleasure this opportunity of doing justice to that great man, whose faults I knew, whose virtues I admired; and whose memory, as the greatest general and as the greatest minister that our country or perhaps any other has produced, I honor."⁷⁷ To Pope, in his lifetime, St. John always showed great kindness and the slights on the poet's character were provoked by the discovery of his treachery in secretly printing copies of The Idea of a Patriot King.⁷⁸ In the great rift between Harley and St. John, the former must bear at least a share of the responsibility. Unfortunately St. John cast all the blame on

75 H.M.C., Portland Mss., viii, 193. William Stratford to Lord Harley, Christ Church, 1 July 1714. For a study of St. John's relations with both his wives, see Lady Mary Hopkinson, Married to Mercury, passim.

76 See I. F. Burton, 'The Committee of Council at the War Office: An experiment in cabinet government under Anne', Historical Journal (1961), IV, 1, 81-84.

77 Bolingbroke's Defence of the Treaty of Utrecht, ed. G. M. Trevelyan, p. 91.

78 See G. G. Barber, 'A Bibliography of Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke', unpublished Oxford B.Litt. thesis (1963), pp. 184-206.

his erstwhile leader and was never generous enough to forgive him any of his faults: "I must always look upon my acquaintance with him, as ye great misfortune of my life, and ye source from whence those waters of bitterness, which I have drunk so large of, have flowed."⁷⁹

If these examples can be cited against St. John it is only fair to look at the other side of the coin. St. John had attractive qualities which made him a stimulating and convivial companion. Among his circle of rakes, and perhaps rogues, were many whom he genuinely liked. These included Coke, Erle, James Brydges and Arthur Moore.⁸⁰ He even managed to remain on friendly, first-name terms, with James Stanhope despite their serious differences in politics.⁸¹ It should also be remembered to his credit that he formed lifelong attachments to Sir William Wyndham and Swift, and he was devoted to his second wife.⁸² Clearly he could hold friends as well as lose them. More striking was St. John's early capacity for hero-worship. Though he himself wished to excel in all things he was frank and generous enough to recognise talent in others. His first hero and model was Sir William Trumbull, the former Tory secretary of state. In 1698 he declared to him: "Having chose you for my pattern, and being resolved to draw as good a copy as I can after so excellent an original, I apply myself to that study in which you became so perfect a master; and

79 B.M.Add.Ms. 34196, f. 2. To his father, 24 July 1717.

80 See H.M.C., Cowper Mss., iii, passim; the Erle papers at Charborough Park; and the Brydges-St. John correspondence, ed. Godfrey Davies and Marion Tinling, Huntington Library Bulletin, nos. 8 and 9, Oct. 1935 and April 1936.

81 Basil Williams, Stanhope, pp. 149 and 259-260.

82 See Lady Mary Hopkinson, Married to Mercury.

tho' I despair of arriving to the same pitch I am resolv'd it shall be my misfortune and not my fault."⁸³ By 1702 he was addressing Trumbull as "Dear Patron, Master and Friend",⁸⁴ and he continued to write to him during his years in parliament. When he was secretary at war, 1704-8, St. John had ample opportunity to witness the splendid talents of the duke of Marlborough and he was ever ready to applaud them. This was so even after his resignation. When he had become convinced of the need to end the war he could still admit: "I should not be soe merry upon soe grave a Subject had I not a faith, wch comes neare toe Superstition, in my Id. Duke."⁸⁵ For some years St. John was under the spell of Robert Harley. In the middle years of Anne's reign his letters to Harley conclude with sentiments like: "Adieu! make haste to town where the public as well as your friends wants you. No man is more entirely, dear Master, yours, than H."⁸⁶

As in his character so in his political career St. John revealed a stark contrast between his transcendent gifts and grave defects. His talents evoked considerable admiration. Swift confessed: "I think Mr. St. John the greatest young man I ever knew; wit, capacity, beauty,

83 H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 782.

84 Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers, Trumbull Add. Mss., 133, bundle 1/1. Letter dated, London, 12 June 1702.

85 'Letters of Henry St. John to James Brydges', ed. G. Davies and M. Tinling, Huntington Library Bulletin (Oct. 1935), no. 8, p. 161. Letter dated Bucklebury, 26 June 1709.

86 H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 121. Letter dated 5 Nov. 1706.

quickness of apprehension, good learning, and an excellent taste; the best orator in the house of commons, admirable conversation, good nature, and good manners, generous and a despiser of money."⁸⁷ Of all his gifts it was St. John's oratory that commanded most attention. Richard Steele, in a piece attacking St. John, admitted:

"Tho' he has not Judgment to chose the right part, he can either Speak, Write, or Debate upon what he does pursue, or take into his Thoughts, with a most specious Force and Energy. Thus, tho' it was the most painful Thing imaginable to a wise Man to hear him Harangue, there was little Help against him, for he charmed all who had not deep Discerning."⁸⁸

Lord Chesterfield was more generous: "I am old enough to have heard him speak in Parliament. And I remember that though prejudiced against him by party, I felt all the force and charm of his eloquence. Like Belial in Milton, 'he made the worse appear the better cause'."⁸⁹ A more

⁸⁷ Journal to Stella, ii, 401.

⁸⁸ The Englishman, ed. Rae Blanchard (Oxford, 1955), p. 288.

⁸⁹ Chesterfield's Letters, iv, 1462. To his son, 12 Dec. 1749. There appears to be no extant drafts of any of St. John's speeches. In Cobbett's Parliamentary History, vi, 301-2, 1330, and 1351 there are short speeches by St. John, and A. Cunningham, History of Great Britain 1688-1727 (London, 1787), ii, 349-50, has a longer speech, but it is not certain these are verbatim reports. In H.M.C., House of Lords Mss., n.s., x, 269 and 493 there are copies of the Queen's speeches to parliament, delivered by St. John in 1714. These are not necessarily St. John's compositions. Even if we had St. John's speeches we would still need to rely on contemporary testimony for the impression he made on his listeners.

substantial quality was St. John's application to business and his capacity for his administrative office. Immediately upon his entry into the Commons he made his mark. A cursory examination of the Commons' Journals is enough to illustrate his energy, and presumably his capacity. As well as playing an important part in impeaching the Junto lords he was appointed to committees dealing with a diversity of topics; the piracies of Captain Kidd, the discharging of seamen without pay, the establishment of the Cottonian Library, the poor of Halifax, the abuses of wire-drawers, the distilling of unwholesome brandies in London, and the encouraging of Greenwich hospital.⁹⁰ All of these in his first months in parliament. As secretary at war he won the praise of Marlborough, who was sorry to lose him in 1708. His industry as secretary of state cannot be questioned by anyone who has consulted the four volumes of his published correspondence. Beautifully composed, both in English and French, they show a minister with remarkable skill in instructing his agents and spies, in informing his colleagues and subordinates, and in negotiating with both his allies and opponents. Swift wrote:

"He had been early bred to Business, was a most Artfull Negotiator, and perfectly understood foreign Affairs. But what I have often wondered at in a Man of his Temper, was his prodigious Application whenever he thought it necessary; For he would plod whole Days and Nights like the lowest Clerk in an Office."⁹¹

90 Commons' Journals, xiii, 416, 514, 553, 575, 738, 748 and 775.

91 'An Enquiry into the Behaviour of the Queen's Last Ministry' (1715), Swift's Prose Works, viii, 135.

St. John not only had a great capacity for ministerial office, but a positive relish for political power. With some justice it can be claimed that political ambition was the motivating force of his entire life. It does much to explain his first years in Parliament as a young man in a hurry, anxious to carve out a career for himself. Though there were other reasons for his breach with Robert Harley, St. John's unlimited ambition was a major contributory factor. His two years out of parliament, 1708-10, only served to stimulate his ambition. He refreshed his contacts with grass-roots Tory opinion and sensed the swing in favour of ending the war with France. At the same time he saw the need to reunite with the main body of Tories under Bromley. In the last ministry of Anne's reign he knew peace would be very popular. He was also aware that the peace would alienate the Hanoverian family, and that the Tories would need to strengthen their hold on the country in order to impose terms on the Queen's successor. His whole challenge to Harley was stimulated by his grasp of political realities; the need to safeguard the position of the Tories. After 1715 he could not retire from politics even when he could not return to parliament. In these years he again showed his appreciation of the political situation. He fought to win over the sovereign, he attacked Walpole for encouraging corruption and faction, and he warned the Tories of the futility of Jacobitism. Clearly he was an unashamed and skilful politician.

St. John's political talents were accompanied by corresponding defects. His chief failure was his inability to manage men. He lacked

the tact and conciliatory skill of which Harley was such a master. His imperious spirit could show the Tories 'game' and his eloquence could sway the rank and file, but he found it difficult to negotiate by personal contact and shrewd bargaining. He could offer a bold lead, but he could not ensure a large following. When Robert Harley was convalescing after Guiscard's murderous attempt on his life the leadership of the Commons devolved on St. John. It was a great opportunity and the secretary of state bungled it. The voting of supplies was endangered by the loss of the leather tax.⁹² St. John recovered from this blow, but continued to have trouble with an unruly House.⁹³ He was probably too much of the patrician to stoop to 'mere management'. In addition his integrity was always suspect and this made it difficult for him to secure unquestioning loyalty. His affectation was of less account than his financial dishonesty. All his life he was dependent upon his family or his wife for much of his wealth. His father survived until 1742 and St. John resented his financial dependence. He was determined to free himself from such restrictions as quickly as possible. At the outset of his career he confessed to Sir William Trumbull: "You know me enough, I believe, to find that I have some spirit, and indeed I have too much to sit easily down under a strait fortune, and though in time if I live my estate will be very considerable, yet for a great while I must expect to

92 Wentworth Papers, pp. 189-190, Peter Wentworth to Lord Raby, London, 27 March 1711, and Burnet, vi, 31-2.

93 See Journal to Stella, i, 215.

be in low circumstances unless I raise 'em myself, and that is what, to you I make nothing a secret, I long to do."⁹⁴ In Anne's reign he held three posts; commissioner of accounts, secretary at war, and secretary of state. The normal remuneration did not satisfy his needs and he attempted to augment it. While he was secretary at war Marlborough secured extra perquisites for him.⁹⁵ In 1714 he was requesting six months' secret service money from the lord treasurer in order to ease his financial straits.⁹⁶ There is strong evidence to believe that he purloined government money or at least made personal gains from the contractors, who supplied the forces in Spain⁹⁷ and the expedition to Quebec.⁹⁸ In the summer of 1714 only the prorogation of parliament prevented the Lords seeking to implicate St. John in Arthur Moore's efforts to defraud the South Sea Company.⁹⁹ With his background of debauchery and dishonesty it was not surprising that neither the Queen nor the average Tory really trusted St. John, however much they admired his talents.

It cannot be denied that St. John was bold, determined to secure political power, and none too scrupulous in his personal or public

94 H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 804-5. Letter dated Lidiard, 13 Aug. 1701.

95 See B.M.Add.Ms. 9100, f. 26. Marlborough to Godolphin, Meldert, 11 July 1707.

96 H.M.C., Portland Mss., v, 379. To Oxford, 6 Jan. 1714.

97 See 'Letters from James Brydges to Henry St. John', ed. G. Davies and M. Tinling, Huntington Library Bulletin (April 1936), no. 9, pp. 130-131. Brydges to St. John, Oct. 1711.

98 See 'The Earl of Oxford's Account of Public Affairs, 6 June 1710 - 1 July 1714', H.M.C., Portland Mss., v, 465.

99 Cobbett's Parliamentary History, vi, 1365.

behaviour. This has led historians to assert that throughout his early career he was an extreme example of the factious, partisan Tory squire, and that his later works attacking parties was a denial of all his active life in parliament. It is true that both in his early years in the Commons and during the last years of Queen Anne he was engaged in partisan attacks on the Whigs. Yet to suggest that he was consistent in this extreme Tory stance throughout his early career is to misread this period of his life. For a time St. John seems to have been converted to Harley's moderate policies. From 1704-8 he worked to support a 'Court-Tory' ministry, and his resignation in 1708 only came when it was clear the Court had become the prisoner of the Whigs.

Because of his ambition and the many inconsistencies in his actions, St. John's Toryism has even been doubted. His family background and education were probably more Whig¹⁰⁰ than Tory and it has been claimed that he only joined the Tory party because he could more quickly establish himself in its less talented ranks. Edward Hopkins, who had travelled in Europe with the young St. John, was shocked when he allied himself with the

100 Henry St. John the elder was apparently a Whig. In 1716 he secured a peerage from George I though his own son had been attainted of high treason. Moreover as early as 10 August 1712 the duc d'Aumont reported about St. John to the French Court: "Son Père Mr. de St. Jean est encore en vie, et est Wight aussy outré que le fils est Thorris, ce qui fait peu de commerce entre eux." Cited by Felix Salomon, Geschichte des letzten Ministeriums Königin Annas von England (Gotha, 1894), p. 356.

Tories: "The Chiefs of the Party opposite to the Court by buoying up his Vanity, of which he was very susceptible, had gained him to that side his whole actions now in publick matters were diametrically opposite to the principles he profess'd with vehemence when abroad."¹⁰¹ Whatever his reasons for becoming a Tory it would be unfair to suggest that St. John did not serve the party of his choice. There is no evidence that he ever supported the Whigs. In 1704 he abandoned the extreme Tories, but this did not make him a Whig. He resisted the Whig infiltration into the ministry and when the task became hopeless he resigned. After the Hanoverian succession he was mortified at the disruption of the Tory party.¹⁰² As a Jacobite secretary of state he hoped to defeat the Whigs again. When this failed he spent many years trying to resurrect the Tory party on a new basis.

It is even more important to recognise that St. John was not devoid of Tory principles. Though he rejected the doctrine of divine right and the idea of an absolute monarchy he was nevertheless a firm supporter of the royal prerogative.¹⁰³ At the outset of his career he had contemplated visiting the Hanoverian Court to declare his loyalty to the legitimate succession.¹⁰⁴ Instead he remained in England to support

101 M. D. Harris, 'Memoirs of the Right Hon. Edward Hopkins, M.P. for Coventry', E.H.R. (1919), xxxiv, 498.

102 See B.M. Stowe Ms., 242, f. 177. St. John to Atterbury, Oct. 1714.

103 See for example his letter to Marlborough, 12/23 Nov. 1706, cited by T. Macknight, The Life of Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, p. 106.

104 H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 804-5. St. John to Trumbull, Lidiard, 13 Aug. 1701.

the power of the new queen. Whatever his personal religious convictions St. John loyally supported the Church of England. To Sir William Trumbull he declared: "I have resolv'd to neglect nothing in my power wch may contribute towards making ye Church interest the prevailing one in our Country."¹⁰⁵ He had helped to bring in the Occasional Conformity bills in the first two parliamentary sessions of the reign, and in 1714 he promoted the Schism bill. When he was involved in tentative Jacobite negotiations he insisted that the Pretender must conform to the Anglican Church.¹⁰⁶ Even more fundamental was St. John's belief that the landed gentlemen were the backbone of the country; and he fully shared the Tory prejudice against the moneyed interest. By 1709 his opposition to the war was based on a conviction that it was enriching the financiers while ruining the landed interest.¹⁰⁷ St. John always loved the country side and country pursuits. Though he was restless, if long excluded from politics he genuinely loved playing the country gentleman. Sir Keith

105 Berkshire Record Office. Downshire Papers. Trumbull Add. Mss., 133, bundle 39/2. St. John to Trumbull, Bucklebury, 2 June 1710.

106 On 29 March 1714 Gaultier, the French agent, reported to Torcy: "Le Grand Turc sera plutost Roy d'Angleterre que le Chevalier tant qu'il sera Catholique Romain; ce sont les dernieres paroles que m'ont dit Mylord Bolingbroke." L. G. Wickham Legg, 'Extracts from Jacobite Correspondence, 1712-14', E.H.R. (1915), xxx, 517.

107 See St. John to Lord Orrery, Bucklebury, 9 July 1709, Bodleian Library. English Mss., Misc. E. 180, ff. 4-5; and Peter Wentworth's report to Lord Raby, 21 Dec. 1710, about St. John's support of the land qualification bill. The Wentworth Papers, p. 197.

Feiling recognised these elements of Tory principle in St. John's make-up, for he wrote: "It is, we believe, a demonstrable and vital truth, that a certain thin continuity of idea runs all through St. John's political life."¹⁰⁸ In order to see the wisdom of this remark it is necessary to turn to a detailed narrative of St. John's political career in Anne's reign.

¹⁰⁸ Feiling, p. 386. An expanded version of this section, entitled 'Henry St. John: a reappraisal of the young Bolingbroke', will be published by the Journal of British Studies.

Appendix I.

Active Tory Peers.

Note.

There are several useful lists of the political inclinations and voting habits of peers in Anne's reign, which can be used to calculate whether a peer was a Whig or a Tory. For this purpose 13 lists have been used. The active Tory peers are those who appear on three of the Tory lists. Some peers are included below, even if they do not appear on three lists, provided they were previously Tory M.P.s or they were not in the Lords long enough to appear on any three lists. The Scottish peers are not included as they cannot easily be classified on Whig-Tory lines. The rare Whig votes (lists 7-13), registered by Tory peers, have been underlined.

Tory Lists:-

1. Those peers who voted for the Occasional Conformity bill, 1703. List in Cobbett's Parliamentary History, vi, 170-171.
2. Those peers who supported Nottingham over the Scotch Plot, 1704. Lords' Journals, xvii, 525.
3. Those peers who voted the Church in danger, 1706. Lords' Debates, ii, 154-161.

4. Those peers who voted to secure the Church in the Act of Union. Lords' Journals, xviii, 225.
5. Those peers who voted Dr. Sacheverell not guilty in 1710. Cobbett's Parliamentary History, vi, 886-887, and Lords' Debates, ii, 276-278.
6. Those peers listed as favouring the Pretender (c. 1712). B.M. Stowe Mss. 224, ff. 330-331.

Whig Lists:-

7. Those peers who voted against the Occasional Conformity bill, 1703. Cobbett's Parliamentary History, vi, 170-171.
8. Those peers who joined in the attack on Nottingham over the Scotch Plot, 1704. Lords' Journals, xvii, 523-524.
9. Those peers who voted Dr. Sacheverell guilty in 1710. Cobbett's Parliamentary History, vi, 886-887, and Lords' Debates, ii, 276-278.
10. Those peers listed as favouring the Hanoverian succession (c. 1712). B.M. Stowe Mss. 224, ff. 330-331.
11. Those peers who voted that the late ministry had not neglected the war in Spain. (1711). Lords' Journals, xix, 213.
12. Those peers who voted against the peace, June 1712. Ibid., xix, 474.
13. Those peers who opposed the Schism Act, 1714. Ibid., xix, 717.

Temporal Peers.

- Montagu Bertie, 2nd Earl of Abingdon: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6.
- John Annesley, 4th Earl of Anglesey (d. 1710): 1, 3, 4, 5.
- Arthur Annesley, 5th Earl of Anglesey: 6. Tory M.P.
- John, Lord Ashburnham: 1, 4. Died Jan. 1710.
- Allen, Lord Bathurst: Tory M.P.
- Henry Somerst, 2nd Duke of Beaufort: 3, 4, 5.
- Robert Benson, Lord Bingley: Tory M.P. Tory creation.
- Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke: Tory M.P. Tory creation.
- Charles, Lord Boyle and Earl of Orrery: Tory M.P. Tory creation.
- John Sheffield, Duke of Buckingham: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.
- Charles Dormer, 2nd Earl of Caernarvon (d. 1709): 1, 2, 3.
- James Brydges Snr., Lord Chandos: 1, 3, 5, 6.
- Francis, Lord Conway: 1, 2, 3, 5.
- William, Lord Craven: 1, 3, 4, 5.
- William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth: 1, 2, 5, 6.
- Basil Fielding, Earl of Denbigh: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6.
- Thomas, Lord Foley: Tory M.P. Tory creation.
- John Leveson-Gower, Lord Gower (d. 1709): 1, 2. Tory M.P. Tory creation.
- John, Lord Granville (d. 1707): 1, 2, 3, 4.
- Heneage Finch, Lord Guernsey: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.
- Francis North, Lord Guildford: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.
- Simon, Lord Harcourt: Tory M.P. Tory creation.

Charles, Lord Howard of Escrick: 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Edward Villiers, 1st Earl of Jersey: 1, 2, 5.

George Granville, Lord Lansdowne: Tory M.P. Tory creation.

Thomas Osborne, Duke of Leeds: 1, 3, 5.

Thomas, Lord Leigh (d. 1710): 1, 5.

William Fermer, Lord Lempster: 1, 2, 5, and 10.

Thomas, Lord Mansell: Tory M.P. Tory creation.

William North, Lord North and Grey: 2, 3, 4, 5.

George Compton, 4th Earl of Northampton: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Daniel Finch, 2nd Earl of Nottingham: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 12, 13.

Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford: Tory M.P. Tory creation.

Other Windsor, 2nd Earl of Plymouth: 1, 5, 6.

John, Earl Poulett: 1, 5. Close ally of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford.

Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Nathaniel Fiennes, Viscount Saye and Sele (d. 1710): 1, 5.

Robert Lake, 3rd Earl of Scarsdale (d. 1708): 1, 2, 3, 4.

Nicholas Lake, 4th Earl of Scarsdale: 5, 6.

William, Lord Stawell: 1, 2, 4, 5.

Thomas Lennard, 1st Earl of Sussex: 1, 4, 5, and 10.

Thomas Tufton, 5th Earl of Thanet: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Thomas Thynne, 1st Viscount Weymouth: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Charles Finch, 4th Earl of Winchelsea (d. 1712): 1, 2, 3, and 9.

Bishops.

John Sharp, Archbishop of York (d. 1714): 1, 3, 4, 5.

Henry Compton, Bishop of London (d. 1713): 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Nathaniel Crewe, Bishop of Durham: 1, 2, 4, 5.

Thomas Sprat, Bishop of Rochester (d. 1713): 1, 3, 4, 5.

Nicholas Stratford, Bishop of Chester (d. 1707): 1, 4.

William Dawes, Bishop of Chester (entered Lords 1708): 5. Tory
Archbishop of York, 1714.

George Hooper, Bishop of Bath and Wells: 2, 3, 5.

John Robinson, Bishop of Bristol (entered Lords 1710): Tory promotion.
Plenipotentiary at Utrecht.

Appendix II.

Active Tory M.P.s.

There are ten extant voting lists, which can be used to calculate whether an M.P. voted with the Whigs or the Tories. Though there are several variations of some of these lists, and none can be regarded as completely reliable, they are nevertheless very valuable evidence of voting behaviour. They can be supplemented by three compilations, which list M.P.s as Whigs or Tories. A fourth compilation (B.M. Stowe Mss. 354, ff. 161-2) has not been used since it lists the M.P.s of the 1705-8 parliament under less helpful headings, like 'True Church', 'No Church', 'Low Church', etc. There is an excellent study of all these voting lists and compilations in W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-14: a study in political organisation', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1965), chapter 2, pp. 59-108, and appendix, pp. 442-5.

The active Tory M.P.s listed below are those who appear on at least three Tory lists, unless they were only in the Commons a short time or were elevated to the Lords where they continued to vote with the Tories.

The lists and compilations used are:-

Tory Lists:

1. Those M.P.s who were against the Lords' amendments to the bill for enlarging the time for taking the oath of abjuration, February 1703.
2. Those who voted to 'tack' the occasional conformity bill to the land tax bill, November 1704.

3. Those who voted for William Bromley as Speaker in October 1705.
4. Those who were against the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell, 1710.
5. Those M.P.s, elected in 1710, who were listed as Tories in B.M. Stowe Mss. 223, ff. 453-56.
6. Those who were listed as members of the October Club in Boyer's Political State, iii, 118-122.
7. Those who were for the Treaty of Commerce with France, June 1713.
8. Those who were classified as Tories after the 1713 election in Lincoln Record Office, Worsley Ms. no. 1.

Court List (mainly Whig):

9. Those who voted against the place clause in the Regency bill, 1706.

Whig Lists:

10. Those who were for the Lords' amendments to the bill for enlarging the time for taking the oath of abjuration, 1703.
11. Those who voted for John Smith as Speaker, 1705.
12. Those who supported the General Naturalization bill, 1709.
13. Those who were for the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell, 1710.
14. Those, elected in 1710, who were listed as Whigs in B.M. Stowe Mss. 223, ff. 453-56.
15. Those who supported an amendment to the South Sea bill, 25 May 1711.

16. Those who voted for 'No Peace without Spain',
7 December 1711.
17. Those who were against the Treaty of Commerce
with France, 1713.
18. Those who were classified as Whigs in Worsley Ms.
no. 1.
19. Those who were against the expulsion of Richard
Steele from the Commons, 19 March 1714.

Note

- i. The rare Whig votes, nos. 10-19, registered by active
Tories have been underlined. Most of these were cast
by Whimsical or Hanoverian Tories opposing the Commercial
Treaty with France in 1713 (no. 17).
- ii. Tories, who were not in the Commons long enough to be on
three Tory lists, have been listed below. The period
when they sat in the house in Anne's reign is given in
order to explain the absence of three figures ~~after~~ their
names.
- iii. Since the Scottish M.P.s did not enter the Commons until
after the Union those who appear on two Tory lists are
classed as active Tories.

- Acton, Sir Edward (M.P. to 1705 only): 1, 2.
- Acton, Whitmore (M.P. 1710-13 only): 5, 6.
- Alcock, Laurence: 1, 3, 4, 5.
- Aldworth, Charles (M.P. 1712-1714 only): 7, 8.
- Annesley, Arthur: 1, 2, 3, 4. Succeeded as earl of Anglesey 1710.
- Annesley, Francis: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 17.
- Anstis, John: 1, 2, 7, 8.
- Archer, Andrew (M.P. 1706-10 and from 1713): 4, 8.
- Arundel, Francis jnr.: 1, 3, 4.
- Bacon, Sir Edmund (M.P. to 1708): 2, 3.
- Bagott, Sir Edward (M.P. to 1708): 1, 3.
- Baldwin, Acton (M.P. 1705-15): 3, 5, 7, 8.
- Bampffield, Sir Copleston Warwick (M.P. from 1710): 5, 6, 8, and 17.
- Bankes, John: 2, 3, 4, 5, 8.
- Banks, Sir Jacob: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.
- Barker, Sir William (M.P. from 1708): 4, 5, 6, 8.
- Barlow, John (M.P. from 1710): 5, 8.
- Barrington, Sir Charles (M.P. to 1705 and from 1713): 1, 2, 8.
- Bateman, Sir James (M.P. from 1711): 7, 8.
- Bathurst, Allen (M.P. 1705-1711): 3, 4, 5, 6. Tory peer January 1712.
- Beaumont, Sir George: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Bellasyse, Sir Henry: 1, 2, 3, 5, 8.
- Bence, John (M.P. 1702-8): 2, 3.
- Bene, Robert (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 8.

Benson, Robert: 4, 5, 7.

Berkeley, John (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 6, 8.

Berkeley, Maurice (M.P. 1705-8 and 1710-16): 3, 5, 6, 8.

Berney, Richard (M.P. 1710-15 only): 5, 7, 8.

Bertie, Charles jnr. (M.P. 1705-8 and from 1711): 3, 8, and 17.

Bertie, Charles snr. (M.P. to 1711 only): 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Bertie, Henry (Westbury): 3, 4, 5, and 17.

Bertie, Henry (Beaumaris): 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.

Bertie, James (M.P. to 1705 and from 1710): 2, 5, and 17.

Bertie, Peregrine (M.P. 1708-15): 4, 5, 6, 8, and 19.

Bertie, Robert (M.P. to 1708): 2, 3.

Bilson, Leonard: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.

Bingham, Richard (M.P. 1702-5 and 1711-13): 2, 7.

Blackett, Sir William, 2nd bart. (M.P. from 1710): 7, 8.

Blackmore, Abraham (M.P. from 1710): 5, 6, 7, 8.

Bland, Sir John, 4th bart.: 3, 4, 5, and 9. On one list he appears as voting for the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell.

Bliss, Thomas (M.P. 1704-8): 1, 3.

Blofield, Thomas (M.P. 1702-5): 1, 3.

Blois, Sir Charles (M.P. to 1709): 2, 3.

Boteler, John: 4, 6, 8.

Bracebridge, Samuel (M.P. from 1710): 5, 7, 8.

Bramston, Thomas (M.P. from 1712): 7, 8.

Bromley, John, Jnr. (M.P. from 1707): 4, 5, 6, and 16, 17, and 19.
(Whimsical Tory).

Bromley, William (Oxford University): 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, and 11 (courtesy vote).

Bruce, Charles (M.P. 1705-12): 4, 5, 7, 8.

Bruce, Robert: 4, 7, 8.

Bruere, George: 5, 7, 8.

Bulkeley, Richard, 4th viscount: 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.

Bulkeley, Thomas (M.P. to 1708): 2, 3.

Buller, James (M.P. to 1710): 1, 2, 3, 4.

Bulteel, James: 1, 3, 6, 7, 8.

Bunbury, Sir Henry: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.

Burgh, John (M.P. 1711-13 and 1714-15): 6, 7.

Burslem, William (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 7, 8.

Byerley, Robert: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8.

Caesar, Charles: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8. Not in parliament for Sacheverell vote.

Cage, William (M.P. 1702-5 and 1710-15): 1, 2, 6, 7, 8.

Campion, Henry (M.P. 1708-15): 4, 6, 7, 8.

Carew, Sir William (M.P. from 1711): 7, 8.

Cartwright, Thomas: 3, 4, 6, 8.

Cary, William (M.P. to 1710): 1, 2, 3, 4.

Cave, Sir Thomas (M.P. from 1711): 7, 8.

Cecil, Charles (M.P. from 1705): 3, 4, 5, 8.

Cecil, William (M.P. to 1705): 1, 2.

Chaffin, Thomas (M.P. to 1711): 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Champneys, Arthur (M.P. to 1705): 2.

- Chapman, Thomas (M.P. from 1710): 5, 7, 8.
- Chernock, Sir Pynsent (M.P. 1705-8 and 1713-15): 3, 8.
- Child, Sir Francis (M.P. 1702-8 and 1710-13): 1, 3, and 15.
- Child, Sir Richard (M.P. from 1708): 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Child, Sir Robert (M.P. 1710-15): 7, 8.
- Chivers, Henry (M.P. 1702-5): 2.
- Cholmondeley, Charles (M.P. from 1710): 5, 6, 8, and 17.
- Chowne, Thomas (M.P. 1710-13): 5, 6.
- Clarges, Robert (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
- Clarges, Sir Thomas (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
- Clarges, Sir Walter (M.P. to 1705): 2.
- Clark, Godfrey (M.P. from 1710): 5, 8.
- Clarke, George (M.P. 1702-8 and 1711-13): 3, 7.
- Clerke, Francis (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 8, and 17.
- Clerke, Sir John (M.P. 1710-13): 5, 6, and 17.
- Codrington, John (M.P. from 1710): 5, 6, 8.
- Coke, Thomas: 1, 5, 7, 8, and 11, 12, 13. Really a Court placeman.
- Colston, Edward, jnr. (M.P. 1708-13): 4, 5, 7.
- Comyns, John: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8.
- Conway, Sir John: 3, 4, 7, 8.
- Conyers, Thomas: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8. On one list he appears as voting
for the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell.
- Cornewall, Henry: 1, 3, 5, and 15.
- Corrance, Clement (M.P. from 1708): 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Coryton, Sir William (M.P. 1703-11): 1, 3, 5, 6.

- Cotes, John (M.P. 1708-15): 4, 5, 8.
- Cotton, Sir John, 4th bart., (M.P. 1705-6 and 1710-13): 3, 6, 7.
- Cotton, Sir John Hynde (M.P. from 1708): 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Cotton Rowland: 3, 5, 8.
- Coulson, Thomas: 1, 2, 3.
- Courtenay, George (M.P. 1708-10 and 1711-13): 4, 5, 6.
- Courtenay, Sir William: 3, 4, and 17.
- Coxe, Charles: 1, 4, 5, 6, 8.
- Crawford, Robert (M.P. to 1705): 2.
- Crawley, Richard (M.P. to 1705): 1.
- Cressett, Edward (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Cresswell, Richard, jnr. (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Crosse, Sir Thomas (M.P. to 1705 and from 1710): 1, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Curzon, Sir John: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Dalby, John (M.P. 1710-13): 6, 7.
- Darcy, James (M.P. to 1705): 2.
- Dashwood, George (M.P. Sudbury 1703-5): 2.
- Dashwood, George (M.P. Stockbridge 1710-13): 5, 6, and 17.
- Davers, Sir Robert: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Dawney, Henry (Lord Downe; M.P. from 1707): 4, 5, 6, 8, and 17.
- Dering, Sir Cholmley (M.P. 1705-11): 3, 4, 5, 6.
- Digby, John (M.P. 1705-8 and from 1713): 3, 8.
- Docminicque, Paul: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 17, 19.
- Dolben, Sir Gilbert: 3, 4, 5, 8, 9.
- Drake, John: 2, 6, 7.

- Drake, Sir William: 3, 4, 5, 8.
- Duncombe, Sir Charles (M.P. to 1711): 3, 4.
- Duncombe, Edward: 4, 5, and 17.
- Duncombe, Francis (M.P. 1708-13): 4, 5, 6, 7.
- Dymoke, Lewis (M.P. 1703-5 and 1710-13): 1, 2, 5, 6, and 17.
- Dyott, Richard: 2, 3, 5, 8.
- Earle, Joseph (M.P. from 1710): 5, 6, 8, and 15, 17.
- Echlin, Robert (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 7, 8.
- Eden, Sir Robert: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.
- Elford, Jonathan: 7, 8.
- Eliot, Edward: 4, 5, 8, and 19.
- Elson, William, snr. (M.P. to 1705): 2.
- England, George (M.P. from 1710): 5, 8, and 16.
- Essington, John (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 8.
- Etherege, Sir James: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 17.
- Ettrick, William: 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 11.
- Eversfield, Charles: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Farrington, Sir Richard (M.P. 1708-13): 4, 5, and 16, 17. On one list
he appears as voting for the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell.
- Ferrier, Richard (M.P. 1708-15): 4, 5, 7, 8.
- Finch, Heneage, snr. (M.P. to 1703): 1.
- Finch, Heneage, jnr. (M.P. 1704-5 and from 1710): 5, 6, 8, and 17.
- Fleetwood, Henry (M.P. from 1708): 4, 5, 7, 8.
- Fleming, Henry (M.P. to 1708): 1, 3.
- Fleming, Richard (M.P. from 1710): 5, 6, 7, 8.

- Foley, Edward (M.P. to 1711): 4, 5, 6, and 11.
- Foley, Paul (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
- Foley, Richard (M.P. from 1711): 7, 8.
- Foley, Thomas (M.P. Stafford to 1712): 4, 5, 9, and 11. Tory peer.
- Foley, Thomas (M.P. Hereford): 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11. [On one list a Thomas Foley appears as voting for the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell].
- Forster, Thomas, snr. (M.P. 1705-8): 3.
- Forster, Thomas, jnr. (M.P. from 1708): 4, 5, 7, 8.
- Fownes, Richard: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.
- Fox, Charles: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.
- Frank, Robert (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 8, and 17.
- Freeman, Ralph: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 17.
- Fulham, John (M.P. 1705-8): 3.
- Fytche, William: 1, 2, 3.
- Gape, John: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.
- Garrard, Sir Samuel (M.P. to 1710): 1, 2, 3, 4.
- Gery, Sir Thomas (M.P. to 1707, and 1710-13): 1, 2, 3, 5.
- Gifford, Benjamin (M.P. 1710-13): 5, 6.
- Gifford, John (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
- Girdler, Joseph: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.
- Glynn, Sir William (M.P. to 1705): 2.
- Gore, William (M.P. from 1711): 6, 7, 8.
- Gorges, Henry: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8.
- Gough, Sir Henry (M.P. 1705-8): 3.
- Goulston, Richard (M.P. to 1705 and from 1710): 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8.

Grahme, James: 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.

Granville, Bernard (M.P. 1710-13): 5, 7.

Granville, George: 1, 4, 5, 9, and 11.

Greville, Algernon (M.P. to 1705): 2.

Greville, Dodington (M.P. from 1705): 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

Greville, Francis (M.P. to 1710): 2, 3, 4, 5.

Griffith, William (M.P. from 1708): 4, 5, 6, 8.

Gwyn, Francis: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8.

Hales, Sir Christopher (M.P. to 1707 and from 1711): 2, 3, 7, 8.

Halford, Richard: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7.

Halsey, Thomas: 4, 5, 6, 8.

Harmer, Sir Thomas: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 17.

Harcourt, Sir Simon: 1, 4, 5, 9, and 11. Tory peer.

Harcourt, Simon, jnr. (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 7, 8.

Harcourt, Simon (M.P. Aylesbury to 1705 and 1710-15): 1, 5, 7, 8.

Hardres, John (M.P. 1705-8 and from 1710): 3, 5, 6, 7, 8.

Harley, Edward (M.P. Leominster): 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 11.

Harley, Edward (M.P. Radnor 1711-15): 7, 8.

Harley, Robert (M.P. to 1711): 4, 5, 9, and 11. Tory peer.

Harley, Thomas: 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 11.

Harpur, John (M.P. to 1705, and 1710-13): 1, 5.

Harris, Roger (M.P. 1712-15): 7, 8.

Hart, Percival (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 6, 7, 8.

Harvey, Edward (M.P. 1705-13): 3, 4, 5, 6, and 17.

Harvey, William, snr.: 2, 3, 4, 7.
Harvey, William, jnr. (M.P. 1710-13): 5, 6, 7.
Hawley, Francis (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
Hay, George (M.P. 1710-1711): 5, 6. Tory peer.
Hedges, William (M.P. 1710-1715): 5, 6, 8, and 17.
Hele, Richard (M.P. 1702-5): 1.
Herbert, Philip (M.P. 1705-7): 3.
Herne, Frederick: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 15.
Herne, Nathaniel: 2, 3, 4, 5, and 15, 17.
Herne, Thomas (M.P. 1706-10): 4.
Heron, Henry (M.P. from 1713): 8.
Heysham, Robert: 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, and 17, 19.
Heysham, William (M.P. from 1705): 3, 4, 5, 8, and 17.
Hickman, Sir Willoughby (M.P. to 1706 and from 1713): 1, 2, 3, 8.
Hickman, Willoughby, jnr. (M.P. 1711-April 1713): 6.
Hill, John (M.P. 1710-13): 5, 7.
Hoblyn, John (M.P. to 1706): 2.
Holmes, Henry: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8.
Hooper, Nicholas: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9.
Howe, Sir James (M.P. to 1705): 2.
Howe, John ('Jack') Grubham (M.P. to 1705): 1.
Howe, Sir Richard Grubham: 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.
Hungerford, John: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 15.
Hyde, Henry (M.P. to 1711): 1, 3, 4, 5. Tory peer.
Hyde, Robert: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.
Isham, Sir Justinian: 1, 3, 4, 6, 8.

- James, John (M.P. to 1705): 1, 2.
- Jeffreys, Edward: 4, 6, 8, and 14, 17.
- Jenkinson, Sir Robert, 2nd bart., (M.P. to Feb. 1710): 1, 2, 3.
- Jenkinson, Sir Robert, 3rd bart., (M.P. from Feb. 1710): 4, 5, 6, 8.
- Jennings, William (M.P. to 1709): 1, 3.
- Jenyns, John (M.P. from 1710): 4, 6, 8, and 17.
- Johnson, Sir Henry: 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.
- Johnson, James (M.P. 1708-13): 5, 6.
- Johnson, William: 4, 5, 8, and 17.
- Jones, Richard (M.P. 1712-15): 7, 8.
- Jones, Roger (M.P. from 1713): 8.
- Kaye, Sir Arthur (M.P. from 1710): 5, 6, 8, and 17.
- Kemp, Sir Robert (M.P. to 1705, 1708-9, and 1713-15): 2, 8.
- Kenyon, George (M.P. 1713-15): 7, 8.
- Knatchbull, Sir Edward (M.P. 1702-5 and 1713-15): 1, 8.
- Kynaston, John: 1, 3, 5, 8.
- Lake, Warwick (M.P. to 1705): 2.
- Lambert, Edmund (M.P. 1708-13): 4, 5, 6, 7.
- Laugharne, John: 4, 5, 8, and 11.
- Lawson, Gilfrid (or Wilfrid): 2, 4, 6, 8, and 17, 19. On another list he appears as voting for the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell.
- Leake, Sir John (M.P. 1708-15): 5, 7, 8, and 13. Always with the Court.
- Lear, Sir Thomas (M.P. to 1705): 1.
- Lee, Henry: 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Leeves, Robert (M.P. April-Aug. 1713): 7.

- Legh, Thomas (M.P. Newton, Lancs.): 1, 2, 3, 5, 7.
- Leigh, Sir Francis (M.P. 1702-5): 2.
- Leving, Sir Richard (M.P. 1710-11): 5, 6.
- Levinz, William: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 17.
- Lewen, Sir William (M.P. from 1708): 4, 8, and 17.
- Lewis, Thomas (M.P. Winchester 1710-13, and Hampshire 1713-15): 5, 6, 8.
- Lister, Thomas (M.P. Lincoln City): 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Lloyd, Henry (M.P. to 1705): 2.
- Lloyd, Robert, snr. (M.P. 1705-8): 3.
- Lloyd, Robert, jnr. (M.P. 1710-13): 5 and 17.
- Long, Sir James (M.P. 1705-13): 3, 4, 5, 6.
- Lutwyche, Thomas (M.P. from 1710): 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Mackworth, Sir Humphrey (M.P. to 1708, 1710-13): 2, 3.
- Manaton, Henry: 2, 4, 5, and 17.
- Manley, John: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.
- Mansell, Sir Thomas (M.P. to 1712): 1, 4, 5, and 11. Tory peer.
- Martin, Sir Joseph (M.P. 1710-15): 7, 8.
- Mead, John (M.P. 1710-13): 5, 7.
- Meeres, Sir Thomas (M.P. 1702-10): 1, 3, 4.
- Mews, Sir Peter (M.P. from 1710): 5, 7, 8.
- Middleton, John (M.P. 1703-4 and 1710-13): 6, 7, 8.
- Middleton, Sir Richard: 3, 4, 5, 8.
- Milborne, Clayton (M.P. 1708-15): 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Mitchell, John (M.P. 1702-5, 1713-15): 2, 7, 8.
- Moore, Arthur: 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9.

Mordaunt, Sir John: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.

Morgan, Sir Thomas (M.P. from 1712): 7, 8.

Morice, Sir Nicholas: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.

Morley, George (M.P. to 1704, 1705-8, and 1710-11): 3, 5.

Mostyn, Sir Roger: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, and 17.

Mostyn, Thomas (M.P. to 1705): 2.

Mundy, Edward (M.P. 1711-15): 7, 8.

Musgrave, Sir Christopher, 4th bart., (M.P. to July 1704): 1.

Musgrave, Sir Christopher, 5th bart., (M.P. 1713-15): 8.

Musgrave, Christopher, jnr. (M.P. to 1705): 1.

Musgrave, Joseph (M.P. 1713-15): 8.

Mytton, Richard: 1, 3, 5, 6.

Napier, Sir Nathaniel, 3rd bart.: 1, 3, 5, 7, 8.

Newdigate, Richard (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 7, 8.

Newland, Sir George: 3, 4, 6, 8, and 17.

Newland, William (M.P. from 1710): 5, 8, and 17.

Nicholas, Edward: 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11.

Nicholas, William (M.P. 1705-8): 3.

Norreys, Sir Edward (M.P. to 1708): 2, 3.

Norreys, Francis (M.P. to 1706): 1, 2, 3.

Norris, John (M.P. 1713-15): 8.

North, Charles: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7.

North, Dudley (M.P. from 1710): 5, 8.

Northey, Sir Edward (M.P. from 1710): 7, 8.

Northey, William (M.P. from 1713): 8.

- Northleigh, Stephen (M.P. from 1713): 8.
- Oglethorpe, Theophilus (M.P. 1708-13): 4, 5, 6, 7.
- Ongley, Sir Samuel (M.P. 1710-15): 8.
- Orde, William (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
- Packer, Robert (M.P. from 1712): 7, 8.
- Paget, Henry (M.P. to 1712): 4, 5, 9, and 11.
- Pakington, Sir John: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Palgrave, Thomas (M.P. 1703-5): 2, 3.
- Palmer, Sir Geoffrey (M.P. 1708-13): 4, 5.
- Palmer, Nathaniel: 1, 7, 8.
- Palmer, Christopher (M.P. 1706-April 1713): 4, 5, 8.
- Parker, Sir George (M.P. 1705-8, 1710-13): 3, 5, 6.
- Parker, Sir Henry (M.P. 1702-5): 1, 2.
- Parker, Hugh (M.P. to 1708): 2, 3.
- Parsons, Sir John: 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 17.
- Paske, Thomas (M.P. from 1710): 5, 6, 8, and 17.
- Pendarves, Alexander: 1, 4, 5, 7, 8.
- Pendarves, Sir William (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
- Phelipps, Edward (M.P. 1708-15): 4, 5, 7, 8.
- Pierce, Thomas (M.P. 1710-13): 7.
- Pigott, Granado (M.P. to 1705): 1, 2.
- Pinnell, Henry (M.P. to 1708): 2, 3.
- Pitt, George: 3, 4, 5, 6, and 17, 18, 19. Hanoverian Tory.
- Pitt, Robert: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 17, 19. Hanoverian Tory.
- Pleydell, John Morton (M.P. 1705-6): 3.

Pole, Sir William: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.
Pooley, Henry (M.P. 1703-7): 2, 3.
Popham, Francis (M.P. 1706-10): 4.
Popham, John (M.P. March 1714-15): 8.
Portman, Henry: 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.
Powell, George (M.P. 1705-6): 3.
Powell, Sir Thomas (M.P. 1705-8, 1710-15): 3, 5, 8, and 17.
Praed, Thomas (M.P. to 1705): 2.
Praed, John (M.P. 1708-13): 4, 5.
Price, John (M.P. 1708-12): 4, 5.
Price, Lewis (M.P. 1705-10): 3, 4.
Price, Thomas (M.P. 1702-5): 2.
Price, Uvedale (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
Prideaux, Sir Edmund (M.P. from 1713): 8.
Proby, John (M.P. 1708-10): 4, 5.
Prouse, John (M.P. 1708-10): 4.
Pugh, John: 3, 5, 8.
Pytts, Samuel (M.P. 1710-15): 5, 6, 7, 8.
Quicke, Andrew (M.P. 1711-15): 7, 8.
Radcliffe, John (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
Randyll, Morgan: 1, 4, 6, and 17, 18.
Ratcliffe, Jasper (M.P. 1710-11): 5.
Raymond, Sir Robert (M.P. from 1710): 7, 8, and 14.
Renda, Thomas: 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
Rigby, Edward (M.P. 1705-6): 3.

Roberts, Gabriel (M.P. 1713-15): 8.

Robinson, Samuel (M.P. 1710-13, 1714-15): 6, 7.

Robinson, William (M.P. 1705-8): 3.

Rolle, John (M.P. Saltash 1703-5, Bridgewater 1713-15): 2, 5, 8.

Rolle, Samuel: 5, 6, 8.

Rolt, Edward (M.P. from 1713): 8.

Rolt, Samuel (M.P. 1713-15): 8.

Rous, John (M.P. 1705-8): 3.

Rowney, Thomas: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.

Sacheverell, Robert (M.P. 1705-8, 1710-15): 3, 5, 6, 8.

St. John, Henry (M.P. to 1708, 1710-12): 1, 5, 9, and 11. Tory peer.

St. Loe, George (M.P. to 1705): 1.

Sawle, Joseph (M.P. 1702-6): 2.

Sawyer, John (M.P. 1713-15): 8.

Scalater, Thomas (M.P. from 1713): 8.

Scobell, Francis: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.

Scudamore, James: 3, 4, 5, 8. On one list he appears as voting for the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell.

Seymour, Charles (M.P. 1703-5): 2.

Seymour, Sir Edward, 4th bart., (M.P. Exeter to 1708): 2, 3.

Seymour, Sir Edward, 5th bart., (M.P. from 1708): 4, 5, 8.

Seymour, Edward (M.P. 1710-11): 5.

Seymour, Sir Henry: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Seymour, William (M.P. 1702-5, 1710-13): 2, 7.

Shakerley, Peter: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 17, 19. Hanoverian Tory.

Sharpe, John, jnr.: 3, 4, 6, 7, 8.

Shepherd, Samuel, jnr.: 4, 5, 6, and 17, 18, 19.

Sheppard [or Shepherd], James (M.P. 1711-15): 6, 7, 8.

Shippen, William (M.P. 1707-9, and from 1710): 7, 8.

Shirley, Robert (M.P. 1713-14): 8.

Shuttleworth, Richard: 3, 4, 6, 8, and 17.

Sibthorpe, John (M.P. 1713-15): 8.

Skipworth, Sir Fulwar (M.P. 1713-15): 8.

Smithson, Hugh (M.P. 1702-5, and from 1710): 1, 2, 5, 6, 8.

Snell, John (M.P. Exeter 1702-8, 1710-13): 2, 3, 5, 7.

Sneyd, Ralph (M.P. 1713-15): 8.

Sparke, John (M.P. to 1707): 2, 3.

Squire, Robert (M.P. 1705-7): 3.

Stapylton, Sir Bryan: 2, 4, 5, 6, 8.

Stapylton, Sir John (M.P. 1705-8): 3.

Statham, Sir John (M.P. 1713-15): 8.

Stephens, William: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

Stonehouse, Sir John: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.

Stote, Bertram (M.P. 1702-5): 2.

Stradling, Sir Edward (M.P. from 1710): 5, 8.

Strangeways, Thomas, snr.: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Strangeways, Thomas, jnr.: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.

Stuart, Sir Simeon (M.P. 1708-13): 4, 6.

Sturt, Sir Anthony (M.P. 1713-15): 8.

Swift, Samuel: 3, 4, 5, 7, 8.

Thorold, Sir John (M.P. to 1705, and 1711-15): 1, 2, 6, 8, and 17, 19.
Hanoverian Tory.

Thynne, Henry (M.P. to 1708): 1, 2, 3.

Toke, John (M.P. 1702-8): 2, 3.

Tollemache, Lionel, earl of Dysart, (M.P. to 1707): 2, 3.

Tomkyn (or Tonkin), Thomas (M.P. 1714-15): 8.

Trelawny, Sir Harry (M.P. 1708-10): 4.

Trevanion, John: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

Trevelyan, Sir John (M.P. from 1708): 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

Trotman, Samuel (M.P. from 1707): 4, 5, 8.

Turner, Sir Edmund: 2, 3, 5, 7, 8.

Tylney, Frederick (M.P. to 1705, 1708, and 1710-15): 5, 6, 7, 8.

Vaughan, Edward: 2, 3, 4, 5, 8.

Vaughan, John (M.P. to 1705): 2.

Vaughan, Richard: 3, 5, 8.

Verney, John (M.P. to 1707): 1, 3.

Verney, Sir John (M.P. from 1710): 5, 6, 8.

Vernon, George (M.P. to 1705 and 1713-15): 2, 8.

Vernon, Henry (M.P. 1713-15): 8.

Vernon, Thomas (M.P. from 1710): 5, 6, 7, 8.

Villiers, John Fitzgerald (M.P. 1705 only): 3.

Villiers, William (M.P. 1705-8): 3.

Vincent, Sir Francis (M.P. 1710-13): 5, 6.

Vyvian, Sir Richard (M.P. 1703-8, 1712-13): 2, 7.

Walcott, Humphrey (M.P. from 1713): 8.

- Walpole, Horatio, snr.: 3, 4, 7, and 18.
- Walter, Sir John: 4, 5, 7, 8.
- Warburton, Sir George (M.P. 1702-5, and from 1710): 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, and 17.
- Ward, John (M.P. Newton): 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 17.
- Ward, William, jnr. (M.P. 1710-13): 5, 7.
- Warner, Henry (M.P. 1711-13): 7.
- Warre, Sir Francis: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.
- Warren, Borlase (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
- Webb, John (M.P. 1705-8): 3, 9.
- Webb, Thomas (M.P. 1708-13): 4, 5, 6.
- Weld, Joseph (M.P. 1709-12): 4, 5.
- Wessell, Leonard (M.P. 1702-5): 2.
- Whitaker, Henry (M.P. 1711-15): 6, 8.
- Whitlock, Sir William: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Williams, Sir Edward: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.
- Williams, Sir William (M.P. 1708-10): 4.
- Willoughby, Francis (M.P. from 1713): 8.
- Windsor, Dixie: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 17.
- Windsor, Thomas (M.P. 1705-11): 4, 5. Tory peer.
- Winnington (alias Jeffreys), Edward (M.P. from 1708): 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Winnington, Salway: 5, 6, 7, 8.
- Winstanley, James: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 17.
- Wishart, Sir James (M.P. 1711-15): 7, 8.
- Withers, Sir William (M.P. from 1707): 4, 8, and 17.
- Wodehouse, Sir John (M.P. 1705-8 and 1710-13): 3, 5, 7.

Wood, Nicholas (M.P. 1708-10): 4.
Woolcombe, John (M.P. 1702-5): 1.
Wren, Christopher (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
Wrey, Sir Bouchier (M.P. 1712-15): 7, 8.
Wrightson, William (M.P. from 1710): 6, 7, 8.
Wroth, Sir Thomas: 1, 3, 4, 6, 8.
Wyche, Germin (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
Wyndham, Sir William (M.P. from 1710): 5, 6, 7, 8.
Wynne, John (M.P. 1713-15): 8.
Wynne, Richard: 3, 4, 8, and 14.
Yarde, Gilbert (M.P. 1705-7): 3, 9.

Scottish M.P.s:-

Abercrombie, James (M.P. 1710 only): 4.
Carnegie, John: 7, 8.
Hamilton, George (M.P. 1712-13): 7.
Houston, John: 4, 7, 8.
Lockhart, George: 4, 7, 8.
Mackenzie, Alexander: 7, 8.
Murray, Sir James: 7, 8.
Murray, James: 7, 8.
Paterson, Sir Hugh: 7, 8.
Reid, Sir Alexander (M.P. 1710-13): 7.
Ross, Charles: 4, 7, 13.
Urquhart, Robert, jnr. (M.P. 1708-10): 4.

PART TWO.

HENRY ST. JOHN AND THE
LEADERSHIP OF THE TORIES, 1702-14.

Chapter Five.

Henry St. John: A Leader in the Making.

In the last years of William III's reign the King's attempt to construct mixed ministries was virtually abandoned. The two party structure, Whig and Tory, began to re-emerge as the basis of divisions in parliament, and, though it never disappeared, the Court - Country dichotomy was less in evidence. The Tories began, after several years of sullen opposition, to abandon Jacobitism and accept the basic terms of the Revolution. It was largely due to two former Whigs, Robert Harley and Paul Foley, that the Tory backbenchers ceased to belong simply to a 'Country' party or a 'Church' party. The two factions were fused before the accession of Anne and a revived Tory party began to dominate the parliamentary scene. The Seymours and Musgraves became the allies of the Foley - Harley group. Together they worked for the interests of the landed gentry; witness their abortive attempts to establish a Land Bank as a rival to the Whigs' Bank of England. The new Tory party also worked to reduce the armed forces, a policy which this time met with some success. The King's ministers, the Whig Junto, who were unpopular with all the Tories, came under heavy attack in the last years of the reign. The Tories hated the toleration of Dissenters, which was supported by the King and his Whig ministers, but at this time they found even more acute political issues to exploit; the succession problem and the partition treaties signed by the King. By the end of 1700 the King had begun to turn to the Tories. Rochester and Godolphin entered

the cabinet, while Harley, though he was given no high office, had regular interviews with William III. When the Tories secured a majority in the general election early in 1701 Harley began to think in terms of a Tory ministry.¹

In the new parliament, which met in February 1701, one of the new members was the young Henry St. John. Though his background may have been more Whiggish than Tory, he had no hesitation in aligning himself with the Tory squires on the backbenches. According to Bonet, the experienced Prussian agent, the Commons could be dominated by a few eloquent men.² The Tory squires were more easily led by fiery speakers than the more sophisticated Whigs and St. John may have seen an opportunity of making a name for himself as their spokesman. He may also have judged that the Whig party was not only a minority group, but in considerable disarray at this time, and that the immediate future lay with the Tories. It must be added, however, that St. John was always a defender of the landed interest and may have joined the Tory squires as a question of principle. Whatever his reasons for joining the Tories his ability soon made him a leading figure on the backbenches.

One of the first issues that came before parliament was the question of the succession, a problem made acute by the death of the duke of Gloucester. The solution devised was to recognise the Hanoverian

1 For the emergence of the new Tory party under Harley see Feiling, pp. 311-342.

2 B. M. Add. Ms. 30,000, f. 393. Dispatch to Berlin, dated 11/22 Nov. 1701.

family as next in succession to Princess Anne, should she fail to produce an heir of her own body. This arrangement was embodied in the Act of Settlement, in which the Tories inserted several clauses meant as an indictment of the conduct of William III and as a means of preventing any Hanoverian successor from following a similar course of action.

Nevertheless, the Tories made no opposition to this measure and it passed the Commons nemine contradicente on 14 May 1701.³ It has often been asserted that St. John was one of those who helped to bring the bill into the house.⁴ In fact there is no reference to St. John supporting the Act of Settlement and historians have probably been misled by the reference to St. John being ordered to prepare "a Bill for a security of his Majesty's Person, and the Succession of the Crown in the Protestant Line; and extinguishing the Hopes of the pretended Prince of Wales."⁵

3 Feiling, p. 345. Feiling shows that the Tories at this time were singularly free from Jacobite tendencies. A few months later, upon the death of the exiled James II, Henry Norris wrote: "The Jac[obite]s are in great confusion among y^{mselves}, a great many of y^{ou} are not resolv'd as yet to own ye P[rince] of Wales to be their King. There is but few persons yet in Mourning for K[ing] J[ames] his death." Liverpool Public Library. Norris papers. 920 NOR 137. To Richard Norris, London, 20 Sept. 1701.

4 Sir Charles Petrie, Bolingbroke, p. 52; Thomas Macknight, The Life of Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, p. 56; Sir Douglas Harkness, Bolingbroke. The Man and his Career, p. 33.

5 Commons' Journals, xiii, 657. This was ordered on 9 January 1701/2, after a general election had intervened between this measure and the Act of Settlement of the previous year.

This was a different, and much less important bill.

St. John's part can be traced, however, in all the Commons' activities against the Whig Junto, especially in the attacks on the Partition treaties. On 21 March 1701 a committee, which included St. John, was appointed to draw up an address against the Partition treaties,⁶ by which the King and his ministers had attempted to solve the thorny question of the Spanish succession problem. Three weeks later the Commons voted to address the King to remove Lord Somers for his part in the Partition treaties. Henry St. John was one of the tellers for the majority.⁷ Next day, 16 April, the Whigs sought to amend the address "to prevent the ill Consequences that seem to threaten the Peace of Europe, and the Interest and Trade of this Nation, by the present Union of France and Spain." This was defeated by the Tory majority, and once again St. John was one of the tellers.⁸ The Whigs then tried to deflect the Tory attacks by manipulating public opinion. Their leaders stage-managed the Kentish Petition of 8 May 1701, which implied that the Commons were misguided and ungrateful in their attacks on the King.⁹ The Tories were furious at this criticism of their actions and on 16 May St. John was one of the committee chosen to address the King against those raising 'tumults and seditions'.¹⁰ The Whig

⁶ Ibid., xiii, 419.

⁷ Ibid., xiii, 492. 15 April 1701.

⁸ Ibid., xiii, 497.

⁹ Feiling, pp. 350-51.

¹⁰ Commons' Journals, xiii, 540.

majority in the Lords then tried to save Lord Somers and the other peers, Halifax, Portland, and Orford, from the threatened impeachments by indemnifying them before the trials opened. On 20 June 1701 a specific motion in the Commons attacked this move as likely to cause a breach between the two houses. Once again St. John was a teller for the majority in favour of this motion.¹¹ He claimed that his action was dictated by a wish to force the King to change his measures and by a desire to safeguard the constitution:

"The design of that party for whom you and I have so great respect," wrote St. John to Sir William Trumbull, "is to widen the breach to that degree that they may be able to persuade the King it will be impossible for this House of Commons to meet the Lords in another session with any success. But if I take it aright, my Id Somers and his partizans have managed their affairs so very wisely that it is no longer the cause of this particular impeachment, but of all that ever may happen in the course of time. It is whether the Commons shall suffer the Lords to break through all the rules of reason, all the constitution of Parlmt., that my Lord Somers may by undergoing a sham trial evade that justice which he deserves; it is in short the cause of my Id Somers against all the gentlemen of England."¹²

In these attacks on the Whig lords St. John acted with the Tory extremists of long standing, Seymour and Musgrave, and with the rising

¹¹ *Ibid.*, xiii, 639.

¹² H.M.C., *Downshire Mss.*, I, ii, 803. Letter dated Battersea, 22 June 1701. It is significant that St. John regarded a Tory majority in such terms as "all the gentlemen of England." The Lords dismissed the impeachments, but a strong minority of Tories, including Rochester, Nottingham, Marlborough, Godolphin, and Bishop Compton of London, registered their protests. *Feiling*, p. 351.

young Tories, William Bromley and Simon Harcourt. The Speaker, Robert Harley, though he was later to be the apostle of moderation, was just as hostile to the Junto leaders, especially Somers.¹³ St. John was already a friend of Harley and discussed politics with him,¹⁴ but he had not been persuaded to moderate his attacks on the Whig leaders. The King felt obliged to prorogue parliament on 24 June, and, when the Tories refused to give a guarantee not to revive the constitutional feud over the impeachments, he dissolved parliament on 11 November.¹⁵ During the recess St. John had been considering his position. His straitened circumstances made him anxious to secure a good position at Court. This might be difficult to attain if, as seemed possible, the King should turn once again to the Whigs, and St. John even considered setting out for Hanover to seek his political fortune there. To Sir William Trumbull he wrote:

"I might venture to go to Hannover, where I should propose serving my country by being near those that are like to wear the crown of England, and laying the foundation of a future fortune to myself; but if the Parl. should address to the King to invite the Princess Sophia into England, which he will hardly do of himself, then my ends would be lost, and I by consequence should not desire the employment. And then on the other side if the old rogues return again

13 Clayton Roberts, The Growth of Ministerial Responsibility in Stuart England, pp. 309-312. Feiling, pp. 348-50, was wrong in believing that Harley acted in a conciliatory rôle.

14 "I dined yesterday with the Speaker, but there was so much company all the time that he never laid his banter one minute aside." H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 810. St. John to Sir William Trumbull, London, 31 Oct. 1701.

15 Feiling, p. 353.

into play, it will be, I fear, impossible for me to keep a Place at Court and in St. Stephen's Chapel. Something I should be glad to do."¹⁶

This seems to be an honest appraisal of St. John's position at this early stage of his political career. He was ambitious for power, he desired a place, he sought to promote his own fortune, but he sided with the Tories. There was no trace of Jacobitism, but he regarded the Whigs as rogues. "I shall, I believe," he told Trumbull, "have more grounds to desire an employment than I can tell you in this letter, else in these times I should not be ambitious of pushing myself into business. It would vex a man to learn with pain and trouble how to serve his country, and yet not be able to do it, and this, I fear, is the case among those few that are honest in public station."¹⁷

The Tories were indignant at the King's decision to dissolve parliament so soon after a general election. Godolphin resigned and St. John protested to Trumbull: "You have seen without doubt the proclamation, and have read it, I dare say with the same indignation that I felt. The King is desirous to meet a Parliament of good Englishmen and Protestants, in order to which he dissolves us, and thus we are sent into the country with libels affixed to our backs."¹⁸ The Whigs had planned another 'libel'. They circulated a blacklist of members of the late parliament, who had met at the Vine Tavern in Long Acre, and who, the

¹⁶ H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 805. Letter dated Lidiard, 13 Aug. 1701.

¹⁷ Ibid., I, ii, 806. Letter dated Lydiard Tregoze, 24 Aug. 1701.

¹⁸ Ibid., I, ii, 810-11. Letter dated 12 Nov. 1701.

blacklist claimed, ought to be opposed in the ensuing elections "by all that intend to save their Native Country from being made a Province of France." There followed a list of twelve complaints against these members, including accusations that these members had encouraged the French King to proclaim the Prince of Wales. This blacklist¹⁹ included most of those who were to lead the Tory party over the next fifteen years, namely Robert Harley, Sir Edward Seymour, Sir Christopher Musgrave, Simon Harcourt, William Bromley, and Henry St. John. Altogether the blacklist gives the names of 167 M.P.s. Of these, forty-four do not appear on any of the ten voting lists that have survived for Anne's reign; some of course did not sit in any parliament during her reign. Six of the remaining 123 were either mistakenly regarded as Tories, or later changed their party allegiance, for they afterwards consistently voted Whig.²⁰ Another nine became placemen, which explains their inconsistent voting record in the next few years.²¹ Between them the remaining 108 members

19 The blacklist can be seen in Bodleian Library, Pamphlets 242, no. 11.

20 Francis and Sydney Godolphin followed Lord Godolphin when he virtually moved over to the Whigs in Anne's reign. Two long-standing army officers, George Fletcher and John, Lord Mordaunt, also followed Marlborough into the Whig camp. Thomas Jervoise, who had registered a single Tory vote in 1700, never again voted Tory. A Thomas Freke voted Whig in Anne's reign, but he may not have been the same Thomas Freke, who is included on this blacklist, for he was not in the Commons at this time.

21 The nine were:- Sir John Bland, commissioner of customs; James Brydges, paymaster general; Sir Godfrey Copley, commissioner of accounts and later comptroller of the army; Anthony Duncomb, commissioner of prizes and governor of Scarborough castle; William Ettrick, counsel of the admiralty; John Mounsteven, commissioner of prizes and of the royal tin farm; Edward Nicholas, treasurer to Prince George; Sir Joseph Tredenham, comptroller of army accounts; and Charles Trelawny, governor of Plymouth.

recorded 280 votes on the ten lists for Anne's reign. No less than 254 of these were cast on the Tory side. None of the other 26 votes were for the Whigs on clear cut party issues like the General Naturalization Act or the trial of Dr. Sacheverell. Six were cast for the Court in 1705 and another five in 1706, when these Tory members were still supporting a mixed ministry that had not yet been captured by the Whigs.²² Three leading Tory London merchants²³ opposed the South Sea bill in 1711, and the other twelve votes were cast by Hanoverian Tories in the last years of Anne's reign.²⁴ Clearly none of these 108 members could be regarded as Whigs, even when some of them occasionally voted as allies of the Whig party. Equally clearly, whatever the accusations that St. John was without political principles, the young M.P. was already bracketed with those Tory leaders with whom he was to work over the next fifteen years.

22 In 1705 Harley's supporters voted for John Smith as Speaker. These were Henry St. John, Sir Simon Harcourt, Thomas Harley, Edward Harley, and Robert Harley himself. William Bromley, Smith's opponent, voted for Smith as a matter of courtesy. In 1706 the same group was still supporting the Court. Henry St. John, Sir Simon Harcourt, Thomas Foley, Thomas Powys, and Robert Harley voted against the place clause in the Regency bill.

23 Sir Francis Child, and Frederick and Nathaniel Herne.

24 Ten votes were against the Commercial Treaty with France in 1713. The Tory members were Sir Jacob Astley, James Bertie, Sir William Courtenay, Sir James Etheredge, Ralph Freeman, Nathaniel Herne, Robert Heysham, Henry Manaton, Sir John Parsons, and Peter Shakerley. Two of these, Heysham and Shakerley, went on to oppose the expulsion of Steele in 1714.

The Tories were not slow to reply to the Whig propaganda, and they charged their opponents with pillaging the state and with intending to establish Presbyterianism.²⁵ Davenant satirised the Whigs in The True Picture of the Modern Whig, but in general the Whigs had the better of the paper war. The public were disturbed at the factious disputes in parliament at a time when the question of the Spanish succession was becoming an acute problem. Three Tory extremists, Davenant, Howe, and Hammond, were defeated and Sir Christopher Musgrave, who came bottom of the poll at Westmorland, had to seek refuge at Totnes.²⁶ St. John, however, secured his re-election at Wootton Bassett, though his success occasioned a breach with his former acquaintance, the Whig Edward Hopkins, who noted: "This was his second parliament, he coming into England some time before me. The Chiefs of the Party opposite to the Court by buoying up his Vanity, of which he was very susceptible, had gained him to that side."²⁷

25 B.M.Add.Ms. 30,000, f. 399. Bonet's dispatch to Berlin, dated London, 18/29 Nov. 1701.

26 Feiling, p. 356. In the new parliament the Tories voted the blacklist a scandalous reflection on the honour of the house, but they failed to carry a motion accusing those who had advised the King to dissolve parliament of endeavouring to subvert the government and destroy the constitution of the house. H.M.C., Various Collections, viii, 85. Thomas Smith to John Roades, London, 19 Feb. 1702. The votes reflect the delicate balance of the parties in the new parliament.

27 M. D. Harris, 'Memoirs of the Right Hon. Edward Hopkins, M.P. for Coventry', E.H.R. (1919), xxxiv, 498.

After the elections the two parties appeared nicely balanced and the choice of a Speaker was vital. On 26 December St. John was seeking to arrange an immediate meeting with Robert Harley, no doubt to concert action over the forthcoming contest for the Speakership.²⁸ Four days later St. John was seconding Harley's elevation to the chair of the house.²⁹ It was a close contest; Harley defeated the King's candidate, Sir Thomas Littleton, by only four votes.³⁰ In the new parliament St. John again took a leading part in affairs. He appeared on numerous committees, including the one to draw up an answer to the King's address.³¹ The Tories had not forgotten their failure to impeach the Whig peers and, on 26 February 1702, St. John helped to move a protest that the Commons 'had not right done them in the matter of the impeachments'.³² The motion was narrowly defeated, 235 to 221 votes, in a very full House. The Tories had been greatly strengthened, however, by the leading part taken in this motion by Robert Harley. Lord Shaftesbury confessed: "This

28 H.M.C., Bath Mss, 1, 54. The Whigs were also preparing for the contest. "All your friends here beg you will not fail to order your affairs so as to be up the 1st day of Parliament; for if wee lose our Speaker we shall lose everything and England into the bargain," wrote Charles Hotham to Lord Irwin, London, 13 Nov. 1701. Leeds City Library. Temple Newsam Mss. Correspondence, box 9.

29 Commons' Journals, xiii, 645.

30 Bodleian Library. Locke Ms. c. 12. Peter King to Locke, 30 Dec. 1701.

31 Commons' Journals, xiii, 647. 2 Jan. 1701/2. St. John was particularly active in the committees dealing with the Irish forfeitures. Ibid., xiii, 747, 764-5, 820, 833, 837.

32 Ibid., xiii, 767.

behaviour of Mr. Harley extremely troubles me, for he looses all reputation and trust among us; for all strength of the Tories or Church party is nothing but by that force which he brings over to them from our side."³³

Upon the death of William III, St. John was one of those members responsible for presenting an address of condolence and congratulation to the new Queen.³⁴ With this accession of a Queen, who had shown her devotion to the Church of England and her predilection for the Tories, that party's fortunes revived spectacularly. Lord Normanby wrote to the earl of Nottingham:

"I believe it unnecessary to inform your L[or]d[shi]p of the K[ing]'s dying on Sunday morning and of the Queen's being proclaimed that afternoon with the greatest appearance of Joy among all sorts of people, that ever I yet saw on the like occasions; they, whom you may guess, affecting it also out of fear to appear singular, if I may use that word for more than one person. The only reason, therefore, of your receiving this trouble is the assurance I have been desired to acquaint you with of the same union as when we met last; and it appears in this particularly, that we intreat & conjure you to come agen among us as soon as possible; which last word I have not put in by chance, but in the strictest sence."³⁵

The elation was not misplaced. Nottingham became secretary of state,

33 Original Letters of Locke, Algernon Sidney, and Anthony Lord Shaftesbury, ed. T. Forster (London, 1830), pp. 174-5. To Benjamin Furley, Chelsea, 27 Feb. 1702.

34 Commons' Journals, xiii, 782.

35 Leicester Record Office. Finch Mss. Box vi, bundle 22. Letter dated Arlington House, 10 Mar. 1701/2.

Rochester became lord lieutenant of Ireland, Sir Edward Seymour was appointed comptroller of the household, Normanby, lord privy seal, Jersey, lord chamberlain, and Harcourt, solicitor-general. Somers,³⁶ Halifax and Orford were all struck off the privy council. These changes had been anticipated in the Commons. Within days of the King's death the House had elected commissioners of accounts to investigate alleged mismanagement in the previous reign. Despite the apparent balance between the two parties the new circumstances helped to secure the election of seven Tory commissioners, one of whom was Henry St. John.³⁷ This post brought St. John a salary of five hundred pounds a year. His fortune seemed assured now that the administration was being put on a Tory footing. In June he visited the fleet in the company of Prince George, the Queen's husband, who was now lord high admiral, and he confessed to Trumbull that he hoped to become a courtier.³⁸ Two months later he accompanied the Queen to Oxford University, where he was awarded an honorary doctorate at Christ Church.³⁹

³⁶ Feiling, p. 365.

³⁷ Commons' Journals, xiii, 808-9. The seven commissioners, in order of votes, were Francis Scobell, William Bromley, James Brydges, Henry St. John, Sir Godfrey Copley, Robert Byerley, and Thomas Coke. "The commissioners were the hottest men in the house, who had raised as well as kept up the clamour with the greatest earnestness." Burnet, v, 6.

³⁸ Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers. Trumbull Add. Mss. 133. Letter 1, dated, 12 June 1702.

³⁹ Arthur Hassall, Bolingbroke (revised ed., Oxford, 1915), p. 8.

The numerous changes in favour of the Tories did not entirely satisfy St. John, who feared the Whigs would still manage to be formidable after the forthcoming general election. "You will see in ye Gazette," he wrote to Trumbull, "that almost all ye Lords Lieutenants are of ye old stamp, in short I wish that some people in order to provide for themselves in another reign, do not make ye present as tumultuous as ye last, and that ye Queen, who deserves to have a better fortune, be not expos'd to all ye uneasiness wch two contending partys must give her." ⁴⁰ Other ⁴¹ Tories were also disappointed that not enough Whigs had been ousted, though the Whigs claimed that even J.P.s and sheriffs were being altered ⁴² to favour the Tories. The Court influence was certainly sufficient to ⁴³ ensure a comfortable Tory majority, though of course the Tories would have won anyway provided the Court had not thrown its influence on the side of the Whigs. St. John was returned for Wootton Bassett and acknowledged to Trumbull the general success of the Tories: "The Elections have

⁴⁰ Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers. Trumbull Add. Mss. 133. Letter 3, dated London, 20 June 1702.

⁴¹ See The Miscellaneous Works of Bishop Atterbury, ed. J. Nichols (London, 1789-98), i, 131-33. Atterbury to Bishop Trelawny, 13 June 1702 and to Dr. James, 23 June 1702.

⁴² P. R. O. Shaftesbury papers, 30/24/20, f. 65. Shaftesbury to Benjamin Furley, 10 Aug. 1702.

⁴³ Ibid.; H. M. C., Cowper Mss., iii, 14. Sir Nathan Wright to Thomas Coke, 25 July 1702; Northants Record Office. Isham Correspondence, bundle 14. Sir M. Dudley to Sir Justinian Isham, 11 May 1702; B. M. Add. Ms. 17677, YY, f. 170. L'Hermitage's dispatch, 28 July/8 Aug. 1702; B. M. Add. Ms. 22852, f. 10 v. Stephen Evance to Thos. Pitt, 1 Aug. 1702; Prussian Mss. 25B, f. 202. Bonet's dispatch 6/17 Aug. 1702; The Diary of John Evelyn, ed. E. S. De Beer (Oxford, 1955), v, 511.

everywhere been carried against the whiggs notwithstanding several little turns that have been made to bring ye partys to an evener poise." ⁴⁴ In the same letter St. John suggested that "if we are wise we shall have it in our power to heal ye wounds our constitution has suffer'd of late years, & to confound and condemn those we have so long exclaim'd agst in ye most factual manner, that is by doing well ourselves." This comment shows that St. John could see the need to moderate partisan activities, though he felt that first the Whigs should be condemned. Like many other Tories he was willing to assist the Jacobites and non-jurors to come to terms with the new Stuart sovereign, now that James II was dead and doubts about the Pretender's legitimacy were still held by some people. To this end the Tories passed a bill, on 27 February 1703, 'for enlarging the time for taking the Oath of Abjuration.' Unfortunately for Tory unity the Lords passed three amendments which would bind those who took the oath more firmly to the Hanoverian succession. The Tories were faced with a choice of opposing the amendments, and thus appearing to support the Jacobite cause, or abandoning the attempt to conciliate the Jacobite minority. The Tories tried to defeat the first amendment, but failed by ⁴⁵ 118 to 117 votes, with St. John voting with the minority. James Johnstone informed George Baillie of the Tories' miscalculation:

⁴⁴ Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers. Trumbull Add. Mss. 133. Letter 6, dated 7 Aug. 1702.

⁴⁵ The Tories then gave up any opposition to the other amendments. For this, and an analysis of the voting, see supra, pp. 35-37.

"The Commons have overacted in everything; so that, instead of breaking in upon the Act of Settlement, a bill this day passed in their House, making it treason to act against the Succession, which is a great and unexpected blow to the Jacobite interest, both here at home, and all over Europe. The Commons sent a bill to the Lords for allowing a new tyme to take the oaths; the Lords, who have lost noe advantage this session, returned the bill, with the addition as above, Thus, the Commons must either agree to declare themselves Jacobites, which the people here will not bear; ... and therefore, tho there was a division about another clause, which, too, was carried for the Lords by one, the clause of treason and the other extending all to Ireland passed unanimously."⁴⁶

This Tory policy of conciliation did not extend to their Whig opponents. On the contrary, in the first two years of the reign the Tories spent most of their energy in a sterile policy of casting opprobrium on the late King and persecuting his Whig supporters. The older Tory leaders, like Rochester and Seymour, encouraged this partisan spirit. The Queen's chief advisers, however, the triumvirate of Marlborough, Godolphin and Robert Harley, sought to maintain domestic harmony while they prosecuted the war in Europe.

While several leading Tories held posts at Court many of the Tory rank and file engaged in factious disputes which hampered the Court's major policies. This anomaly was further complicated by the Queen's preference for the Tory party and her love for the triumvirate and Lady

⁴⁶ The Correspondence of George Baillie of Jerviswood (Edinburgh, 1842),
p. 10. Letter from James Johnstone, 13 Feb. 1702/3.

Marlborough.⁴⁷ This produced a conflict, which soon had her admitting that the zealous Tories were hindering the government and could not be trusted in anything but Church affairs.⁴⁸ Both Marlborough and Godolphin began to see the futility of turning out moderate Whigs to reward Tories, who would only embarrass them.⁴⁹ Bishop Burnet, writing of the Tory appointments, claimed that "the earl of Marlborough assured me this was done, upon the promises they made to carry on the war, and to maintain the alliances: if they kept these, then affairs would go on smoothly in the house of commons, but if they failed in this the queen would put her business in other hands, which at that time few could believe."⁵⁰ Marlborough, by 1703, was warning his wife that the Tories were to tyrannise the Court and some of them would have to be removed.⁵¹ He tried to convince Heinsius "that Her Majesty is firmly resolved not to

47 The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne, ed. Beatrice Curtis Brown (London, 1935), pp. 98-99. Letter to Lady Marlborough, St. James, 24 Oct. 1702, hoping that her love of the Church of England party would not lead to a serious difference.

48 "I am intirely of my dear Mrs. Freeman's mind yt ye heat & ambition of Churchmen has don a great deal of hurt to this poor nation, but it shall never do any harm in my time, for I will never give way in their governing in anything, only sometimes it is necessary to ask their advice in Church matters." To Lady Marlborough, no date (1703-4?). Blenheim Mss. Churchill papers. E. 17.

49 James Vernon told Shrewsbury that Marlborough had not wished to replace him as secretary of state by a Tory. Vernon Corr., iii, 222. Letter dated 1 May 1702.

50 Burnet, v, 10.

51 Coxe, i, 274-77. To Lady Marlborough, camp at Hanef, 3/14 June and 10 June 1703.

enter into any party, but to make use of all her subjects."⁵² To Robert Harley he wrote in 1703: "I am sensibly concerned at what you mention of the heats that continue between the two parties, and should esteem it the greatest happiness of my life if I could anyway contribute towards the allaying them."⁵³ Thus in the first years of Anne's reign Marlborough steadily abandoned the Tory party and cannot really be considered as a Tory leader. This also applied to his close friend and colleague, Godolphin.

This split between the Court politicians and the Tory extremists was always threatening in the first years of Anne's reign. In this dispute the rôle of Robert Harley was to prove crucial. A former Whig, now in many respects a Court politician, he was to have a great effect on the fortunes of the Tory party in general and Henry St. John in particular for the whole of the reign. Harley had helped to lead the Tories out of the wilderness and had tried to educate them to the responsibilities of office. In 1702 he refused to join the older Tory leaders like Rochester and Seymour in a sterile policy of seeking vengeance on the Whigs. While

52 The Correspondence of Marlborough and Heinsius, ed. B. Van't Hoff (The Hague, 1951), p. 13. Letter dated London, 21 April/2 May 1702. For Heinsius's concern at the party strife in England see his letters to the duke of Portland, 1702-3, in Nottingham University Library, Portland Mss. PWA 561, 576, 582, 585, 587, and 591.

53 H.M.C. Bath Mss., i, 56. Letter dated Alderbeeston, 11 Oct. 1703,

opposing any move to bring in the Whigs, he proposed a policy of moderation. After the general election of 1702 he advised Godolphin to combat the artifices of the Tory hot-heads by employing "some discreet writer of the Government's side, if it were only to state facts right; for the Generality err for want of knowledge, & being impos'd upon by the storys rais'd by ill designing men."⁵⁴ The decision of Harley to support the Marlborough-Godolphin ministry at the expense of the other Tory leaders was of supreme importance in the political history of the early years of the reign. Harley was the most skilful parliamentary manager in the Commons and without him Godolphin would have soon been floundering. In these first years the lord treasurer constantly appealed to Harley to exercise his moderating influence on the Tories. Before parliament met, in November 1703, Godolphin wrote: "I depend upon you for thinking in ye meantime of what is to bee done, of all kinds, preparative to its meeting, as well, as of what is to bee said, when it comes, I must also pray you to send me a list or memorandum of such persons as you wish might be consider'd upon occasion of any vacancys that may happen betwixt this & that time."⁵⁵ On another occasion the lord treasurer expressed the hope that Harley could win over Sir Simon Harcourt from the ranks of the high-flying Tories: "As to the matters wee talked of last

54 B.M.Add.Ms. 28055, f. 3. Letter dated Brampton, 9 Aug. 1702.

55 Longleat House. Portland papers. Misc. vol. of Godolphin letters, f. 167. Godolphin to Speaker Harley, St. James's, Fryday, 13 Aug. at 10. [1703?].

night, wd it bee amiss if Mr. Sollicitor were made to understand that the prospect of his being Attorney is not very remote, at present, and a wrong stepp at this time might prove very unseasonable, as to that pretension."⁵⁶ It was largely due to Robert Harley that the ministry weathered the storm of Tory vindictiveness and won over the likes of Henry St. John.

At first, however, St. John took a leading part in the attacks on the Whigs and in the factious party battles. When parliament first met after the general election, on 20 October 1702, the Queen spoke of 'the just and necessary war' which had been declared against France in the previous May. The Commons planned an address to Marlborough for having, by his first operations, "signally retrieved the ancient honour and glory of the English nation."⁵⁷ This was promptly seen as an attack on the memory of William III and the Whigs suggested the substitution of 'maintained' for 'retrieved'. The Tories carried their motion, however, "in spite of Sir John Holland and others who complained twas too gross a reflexion upon the late King. Mr. St. Johns stood up and own'd it was a reflexion, and for that reason he desir'd it should be in, but not so much upon the late King as his Ministers, who, he said, were the worst any Prince ever had."⁵⁸ St. John was supported by other leading Tories, including Seymour, Musgrave, Howe and Harcourt.⁵⁹ Three

⁵⁶ Ibid., f. 124. [Godolphin] to [Harley], Monday noon.

⁵⁷ Commons' Debates, iii, 205.

⁵⁸ National Library of Wales. Penrice and Margam Ms. L. 455. E. Lewis to Thos. Mansell, London, 27 Oct. 1702.

⁵⁹ Prussian Mss., 26 A, f. 24. Spanheim's dispatch of 30 Oct. 1702.

days later the duke of Leeds reported that "Sir Ed. Seymour hath this day made a very good & bold speech for the Church of England, & made many reflections on the late Reign upon that Subject, & was contradicted by no body."⁶⁰ In little more than a week the Tories had also passed a motion, by 189 to 81 votes, that right had not been done them over the late impeachments.⁶¹ The Tories were already showing signs of being totally preoccupied with vindictive attacks on their Whig opponents. In December 1702 they also showed that they were capable of obstructing the Court. The Queen proposed to grant Marlborough a pension of £5000 p.a. from the post office funds as a reward for his services in the first campaign of the war. On 10 December the Commons refused to endorse the grant, justifying their conduct by reference to their criticisms of the exorbitant grants made in the previous reign.⁶² The decision to refuse the grant was very close. The Tories were split on the propriety of opposing the wishes of the Queen on a question of rewarding a Tory commander-in-chief for services in the field. In fact the vote revealed the division between the 'country' element in the Tory party and the 'new Tories', who had emerged in the last few years. It is interesting to see that Seymour, Musgrave, and Bromley opposed the pension, whereas St. John, Granville,

60 Leicester Record Office. Finch Mss., box vi, bundle 22. To his daughter, Wimbledon, 23 Oct. 1702.

61 Commons' Journals, xiv, 12. 2 Nov. 1702. The tellers for the majority were Sir Edmund Bacon and Sir John Curzon, two staunch Tories.

62 Commons' Debates, iii, 210-11.

and Howe voted for granting the Queen's request.⁶³ Robert Harley led his 'new Tories' and spoke at length in favour of the grant.⁶⁴ It would seem that St. John was showing signs of desiring the good opinion of both Marlborough and Harley. He was to continue to vote with the Tory extremists in the next eighteen months, but this may have been his first signal to the Court that he was not intractable.

The Tories had always believed that the Whigs had lined their pockets from exchequer funds.⁶⁵ The Commons again appointed commissioners of accounts to investigate the accounts of the previous reign.⁶⁶ Once more St. John was one of the chosen seven commissioners. He had envisaged, and even planned, this examination as early as August 1702. Then he had written to Sir William Trumbull: "We are now labouring to bring some few of those deeds of darkness, which have long been ye great grievances of this deluded nation, and which have been either cover'd or defended with so much art & industry, to light. In this pursuit you easily imagine we create to ourselves no small stock of envy & ill will on one side; and on ye other I wish we do not find

63 Prussian Mss., 25 C, f. 181. Spanheim's dispatch to Berlin, 18/29 Dec. 1702. The pension was defeated "by means of my Lord Rochester's interest with Sr Christopher Misgrave, Sr Edward Seymour, and the Tory Party in the House of Commons." 'Lord Coningsby's account of the state of political parties during the reign of Queen Anne', Archaeologia (1860), xxxviii, 6.

64 The Norris Papers, ed. Thomas Heywood (Chetham Society, 1846), pp. 106-7. J. Johnson to Richard Norris, 15 Dec. 1707.

65 There were several scandals in William III's reign involving Whig government contractors. Plumb's Political Stability, pp. 138-39.

66 Luttrell, v, 250.

an ungrateful return for all ye pains we have taken."⁶⁷ He need not have worried about the reaction of the Tories. The investigation appealed to all their party prejudices.⁶⁸ By February 1703 the commissioners had brought serious charges of financial irregularity against the earl of Ranelagh, an Irish peer and member of the house of Commons, who had been paymaster-general of the army under James II and William III. On 1 February Ranelagh was expelled from the Commons.⁶⁹ The seven commissioners, including St. John, then began to prepare a detailed accusation of the earl of Halifax. He was charged with not having examined the vouchers for paying annuities every three months and not having transmitted the imprest roll to the King's remembrancers every six months.⁷⁰ It was to Halifax's credit that, after searching investigations by the commissioners, he was attacked on such minor technicalities. When these charges were laid before the Lords the Whig majority there acted quickly in defence of their colleague. On 7 February the Lords referred the matter to a select committee under the Whig duke of Somerset, which committee, after examining a few Treasury officials, issued an interim

67 Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers. Trumbull Add. Mss. 133. Letter 9, dated 21 Aug. 1702.

68 The attacks, which resulted from these investigations, were countenanced by the earl of Nottingham. Carlisle Public Library (Tullie House). The diaries of Bishop Nicolson of Carlisle, no. 2, 2 and 5 Feb. 1702.

69 Commons' Journals, xiv, 171, and Commons' Debates, iii, 247.

70 Ibid., iii, 247.

report exculpating Halifax.⁷¹ The Tory majority in the Commons were furious and, on 11 February, they addressed the Queen, praying that she would order the prosecution of Halifax.⁷² According to Richard Warre: "The Commons have presented an address to the Queen, upon some mismanagements of the revenues in the late reign, so long that it is said it will take half an hour to read."⁷³ At a conference between the two Houses on 17 February the Commons refused to allow the commissioners to attend, arguing that the Lords had prejudged a case not yet formulated.⁷⁴ The Lords defended themselves next day,⁷⁵ and on 27 February the Commons learned that the Lords did not claim to have acquitted Halifax.⁷⁶ According to Francis Atterbury, who was hardly an impartial witness, "My Lord Halifax spoke much in the conference upon the second article, wherein he himself was particularly concerned; but, in the judgement of all who heard him, did his cause no service; and his friends went back to their House with a worse opinion of it than they had before."⁷⁷ The Commons addressed the Queen giving their version of the dispute,⁷⁸ while

71 Lords' Journals, xvii, 270-71.

72 Commons' Journals, xiv, 188-190.

73 H. M. C., Frankland-Russell-Astley Mss., p. 119. To Lord Cutts, Whitehall, 12 Feb. 1702/3.

74 Lords' Journals, xvii, 294.

75 Ibid., xvii, 296.

76 Commons' Journals, xiv, 209.

77 The Miscellaneous Works of Bishop Atterbury, ed. J. Nichols, i, 173. To Bishop Trelawny, London, 25 Feb. 1702/3.

78 Commons' Debates, iii, 260-69.

the Lords published a record of the transactions between the two houses.⁷⁹
Parliament was prorogued on 28 February 1703, before the dispute could be
carried any further, though it was resumed in the next session.⁸⁰

In the second session of Anne's first parliament the two Houses found themselves at loggerheads over the celebrated Aylesbury election case of Ashby v. White. The Whig Lord Wharton had persuaded Ashby to bring a case against White, a constable at Aylesbury, for not allowing him to vote in the general election of 1702. The Tories were indignant, partly because of Wharton's politics, but also because in the case the Lords upheld Ashby's accusation. They regarded this as an encroachment, politically inspired, on the privileges of the Commons. A great debate opened in the lower House on 25 January 1704. Though the Speaker, Robert Harley, urged moderation his erstwhile Tory followers bitterly attacked the verdict of the Lords. A few Whigs, like Sir Joseph Jekyll and Sir Peter King, defended the right of electors to appeal for redress to the common law, and therefore to the Lords if necessary, when they believed their voting rights were infringed. The Tories, among them Seymour, Musgrave and Harcourt, defended the privilege of the Commons to⁸¹ be the sole judge of all electoral procedure. Henry St. John supported the Commons' motion, though his speech was more moderate than those of other leading Tory spokesmen:

79 'The Proceedings of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal ... upon observations of commissioners for taking, examining, and stating the Public Accounts of the Kingdom', Somers Tracts, xiii, 395-98.

80 See infra, pp. 263-264.

81 Commons' Debates, iiii, 308-88.

"Sir, I do not rise up to trouble you long, but to speak to one Point that was mentioned by a noble Lord over the way. I shall be as tender as any Man alive, of doing anything against the Liberty of the People; but I am for this; because I take it to be the greatest Security for their Liberty. The noble Lord was pleased to take notice, that, in the consequence, the Crown would have a great Influence on those that are to return the Members of the House of Commons; and when they were in, they might vote for one another. I cannot think that the Liberties of the People of England are safer in any Hands below, or that the Influence of the Crown will be stronger here than in other Courts."⁸²

It was another sign that St. John was beginning to move away from his intransigent Tory friends, but it did nothing to prevent the case dragging on. Despite the Lords' verdict in his favour Ashby was arrested for infringing the privileges of the Commons and he was not released until parliament was prorogued. The two Houses remained embroiled until the very end of the session.

The investigations of the commissioners of accounts and the Aylesbury case hampered the effective prosecution of the administration's policies, but in the main they were restricted to a party clash between the dominant majorities in the two Houses. Much more alarming for the ministry was the serious divisions within its ranks on how the war should be conducted. Marlborough's strategy was to defeat France by conducting a major land war, but this was opposed by Rochester and Nottingham, two important and influential Tory ministers. Rochester, in a council on 2 May 1702, had urged that England should only undertake an auxiliary role

82 Ibid. , 111, 387.

in the war, placing the emphasis on naval warfare.⁸³ Nottingham was not entirely in agreement with Rochester, though he opposed Marlborough's strategy. He thought the army should not be employed mainly in Flanders, but should conduct operations in more fruitful fields. On 14 August 1702 he wrote to Marlborough: "Considering that a good issue of this war does not depend on any Conquests in the Spanish Netherlands, nor are the States likely to make any, then surely the Troops should be there employed, where they may most annoy France."⁸⁴ His suggestions were to send expeditions⁸⁵ to the Mediterranean and the West Indies.

Henry St. John's views on how the war should be conducted were in many ways similar to those of Nottingham. In June 1702 he complained to Sir William Trumbull that "Landau is besieg'd and a great deal of bustle made in Flanders where nothing is to be got, while Italy lyes neglected where France might be oppress'd."⁸⁶ When the attack on Cadiz failed he was disappointed and became indignant at Whig attacks on the Tory commanders, Ormonde and Rooke: "The Whigs are already laying their trains and striving att what I expected they have condemn'd him [Rooke] already, and according to their laudable custom fill'd every corner of ye town with clamour & lyes."⁸⁷ Yet he did not attack the war in Flanders

83 Abel Boyer, The History of the Reign of Queen Anne digested into Annals, hereafter cited as Boyer's Annals, (London, 1703-13), 1, 14, and Coxe, 1, 152.

84 Northants Record Office. Finch-Hatton Mss., 275, pp. 75-76.

85 Ibid., 275, pp. 33-34 and 37. To Marlborough, 26 and 30 June 1702.

86 Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers. Trumbull Add. Mss. 133, letter 3. Letter dated 20 June 1702.

87 Ibid., letter 13. To Trumbull, 13 Oct. 1702.

and the responsibility for the early disappointments there he laid at the door of the Dutch. He joined in the criticisms on the Dutch field deputies for preventing Marlborough from defeating an inferior French force in the summer of 1702,⁸⁸ and in 1703 he asserted: "Ye Dutch seem ashamed of their pusillanimity, and own that the attack of ye lines was a reasonable proposition. However ye campagne is over and nothing of consequence done in ye only place where we were superior."⁸⁹ Whatever his views on the best strategy for the war St. John did not share the increasing Tory jealousy of Marlborough. Not only had he supported the Queen's proposal for a pension for the general of £5000 p. a., but he was already demonstrating his capacity for hero-worshipping the great commander: "My great dependence is on his admirable good He has ye most glorious field to range in that ever subject had, and it lyes in his power to make himself ye Darling of good men and a terrour of others."⁹⁰ In the parliamentary attacks on the management of the war St. John does not appear to have joined his high Tory colleagues.

Many Tories were not only opposed to Marlborough's conduct of the war, but were prepared to obstruct this conduct by any conceivable means. On 7 January 1703 the Tories in the Commons, led by Seymour, Misgrave, Howe, Finch, and Sir Charles Hedges, who were all the friends of Rochester and Nottingham, demanded that the Dutch should stop all correspondence with

88 Ibid., letter 6. To Trumbull, 7 Aug. 1702.
89 Ibid., letter 25. To Trumbull, 11 Oct. 1703.
90 Ibid., letter 13. To Trumbull, 13 Oct. 1702.

France. When it was decided by the government that the English forces in Flanders should be augmented the Whigs, including Lord Hartington, James Stanhope, and Sir William Strickland, gave their support, but the Tories passed an address, hoping that this would not be necessary. Should it be necessary, they expressed the conviction that the Dutch⁹¹ should be persuaded to abandon all trade with France and Spain. In the Lords, Marlborough, Godolphin, and Somerset urged the augmentation of⁹² the English forces. Nottingham and Rochester were opposed to this, though they suggested the same clause about the Dutch ending all trade with France and Spain. They failed to secure the amendment on 8 January, but succeeded next day.⁹³ In the next parliamentary session the Commons discussed the government's new treaties with Portugal and Savoy and the plans to restore Spain to the house of Austria.⁹⁴ Thomas Coke, a courtier, suggested that the Commons' address should only mention the general agreement of the House with the ministry's actions. This did not satisfy the irascible Sir Edward Seymour, who, seconded by Jeffrey Jeffreys, demanded a detailed examination of the treaties. In his speech

91 Commons' Journals, xiv, 105. The voting was 190-122, with two Tories, Annesley and Sir Roger Mostyn acting as tellers for the majority. According to Bonet the creatures of Marlborough and Godolphin voted in the minority with the Whigs. Prussian Mss. 26 B, f. 22. Dispatch to Berlin, 8/19 Jan. 1703. The names of the leading speakers are given in Spanheim's dispatch to Berlin, 8/19 Jan. 1703. Ibid., 26 A, ff. 30-34.

92 Ibid., and Bonet's dispatch of 15/16 Jan. 1703, ibid., 26 B, f. 29 v.

93 Ibid., 26 A, ff. 30-34. Spanheim's dispatch, 8/19 Jan. 1703, and Lords' Journals, xvii, 233.

94 Commons' Journals, xiv, 213-14.

he spoke so strongly against the Dutch that no one followed his example and even his friend, Jack Howe, refuted his arguments. Once again, however, the ministry was supported by Stanhope and the Whigs.⁹⁵ The whole war effort depended on the voting of supplies and the ministry found the Tories were reluctant to grant supplies while the Whigs were quite enthusiastic. When, on 18 January 1703, the malt tax was brought up to the Lords by Thomas Conyers he was "attended chiefly by whigs, to shew (forsooth) yir zeal for ye support of ye war."⁹⁶ In the next session Marlborough expressed to Heinsius his relief that the high-flying Tories had not been able to prevent the voting of the necessary supplies:

"You will by this post hear the good newse that the House of Commons has agreed to the demands made by Her Majesty for the 40,000, as alsoe the 10,000 augmentation, as well as the other estimates given to them; soe that thay have already voted near five hundred thousand pounds more then the last yeare. I know you will rejoice at this good news, since now all the designs of some few ill affected pepel are quite disapointed, for the House of Commons has dispatched more business this day then thay used to doe in a fortnight."⁹⁷

In the third session Marlborough was furious when the high Church Tories tried to obstruct the voting of supplies until their cherished Occasional Conformity bill had been passed. They tried to ensure this by 'tacking' the latter to the land tax bill. To the ministry it was the last straw.

95 Prussian Mss. 26 B, ff. 286 and 295. Bonet's dispatches to Berlin, 12/23 and 16/27 Nov. 1703.

96 Carlisle Public Library. The diaries of Bishop Nicolson, no. 2, 18 Jan. 1703.

97 The Correspondence of Marlborough and Heinsius, ed. B. Van't Hoff, p. 98. Letter dated London 26 Nov./7 Dec. 1703.

It was this decision of the Tories to pursue their religious policies to extreme lengths that proved the most serious embarrassment to the Marlborough-Godolphin ministry. One source of religious controversy centred on the divisions within convocation. There the bishops of the upper house and the clergy of the lower house mirrored the disputes between the Lords and the Commons. Their arguments took on a political as well as a religious complexion; the bishops being largely low Church and Whig, while the clergy were fervently high Church and Tory. To Harley the despondent Godolphin confessed: "As to ye Convocation, I despair that any thing shd ever bee well and easy there, for neither side cares for agreement nor will any thing please one side but trampling upon the other."⁹⁸ The convocation crisis would have been less troublesome had it not been brought into the parliamentary arena. According to James Johnstone: "Here, the Whigs reigne in the House of Lords, and espouse the Bishops: the Toryes reign in the House of Commons, and espouse the Lower Clergy; [so] that the heats go high."⁹⁹ One example of the merging of the conflicts of convocation and parliament was the case of Bishop Lloyd of Worcester. The bishop and his son had campaigned against the Tory squire, Sir John Pakington, in the Worcestershire election of 1702. The Tory majority voted an address to

98 Longleat House. Portland papers. Miscellaneous vol. of Godolphin letters, f. 130. Letter dated Wednesday night.

99 The Correspondence of George Baillie of Jerviswood, p. 8. To Baillie, London, 21 Nov. 1702.

the Queen, requesting her to dismiss Lloyd from his post as lord almoner. Bishop Nicolson recorded in his diary: "The Commons had an Address from ye lower House of Convocation, thanking them for ye care they had taken of their privileges in Mr. Lloyd's [the bishop's son] case. . Whereupon, resolv'd (on all occasions) to assert ye just rights & privileges of ye lower Clergy."¹⁰⁰ Embarrassing though the convocation crisis was to the ministry, it was a trivial problem compared to that posed by the Tories' attempts to end occasional conformity.

The Toleration act had given the Dissenters liberty of worship, but the laws restricting all offices under the Crown and even the offices in local corporations to Anglicans were still in force. The Dissenters could evade these restrictions by the practice of occasional conformity. By intermittently taking the Holy Sacrament in an Anglican Church, the Dissenters could obtain a certificate, which would qualify them to hold office. The Whigs turned a blind eye to this practice for many of them would have liked to have relaxed the laws against Dissenters for they knew the latter were among their most loyal supporters. The motives of the Tories, in seeking to abolish this method of evading the law, were two-fold: to show their true devotion to the Anglican Church and to exclude from office those who were not loyal Anglicans. This latter point would prevent the Dissenters, and thereby some Whigs, from rivalling the Tories for places. To many Dissenters this presaged the end of toleration and

100 Carlisle Public Library. The diaries of Bishop Nicolson, no. 2, 21 Nov. 1702.

it heralded an era of persecution. The Whigs would not abandon their supporters without a struggle, and, with their majority in the Lords, the Whigs had the ability to block Tory legislation against occasional conformity. This led to the most serious dispute between the two Houses and eventually persuaded the ministry to shift its base away from the extreme Tories.

Henry St. John played a major rôle in the early efforts to abolish occasional conformity. On 4 November the Commons ordered St. John, William Bromley, and Arthur Annesley, to prepare a bill to end occasional conformity.¹⁰¹ The bill they produced proved to be a severe measure, including, as it did, a fine of £100 which was to be paid to the informer who betrayed any infringement of the law.¹⁰² This first Occasional Conformity bill rapidly passed through all its stages in the Commons and, on 28 November, Bromley was ordered to take it to the Lords.¹⁰³ In the upper House the bill was severely amended to make it unacceptable to the Commons. The penalty for infringing the law was reduced from £100 to £20; the accusation against an occasional conformist had to be made before a judge or a J.P. within ten days of the offence; and no Dissenter was to

¹⁰¹ Commons' Journals, xiv, 14.

¹⁰² For the terms of this and succeeding Occasional Conformity bills, and the opposition of the Dissenters to them, see P. M. Scholes, 'Parliament and the Protestant Dissenters 1702-1719', unpublished London M.A. thesis (1962).

¹⁰³ Commons' Journals, xiv, 51. The vote on the third reading was an overwhelming 250-31. Among the tiny Whig minority were Lord Hartington, Sir Richard Onslow, and John Smith. Prussian Mss., 25 B, f. 300 v. Bonet's dispatch of 1/12 Dec. 1702.

be forced to take any office which required taking the Holy Sacrament.¹⁰⁴ These amendments were passed by 54 to 46 votes in the committee of the whole House on 8 December 1702,¹⁰⁵ and the House agreed to them next day and returned the amended bill to the Commons.¹⁰⁶ The bill had been so severely altered that a free conference between the two Houses was desired. The managers chosen to represent each House reflected the party majority prevailing there. The Commons chose William Bromley, Heneage Finch, Sir Simon Harcourt, Thomas Powis, and Henry St. John; all Tories. The Lords selected Devonshire, Halifax, Peterborough, Somers, and Bishop Burnet; all Whigs. During the conference Burnet's observations were aimed at St. John in particular: "L'acte de Tolerance étoit, par sa moderation, un excellent Acte, puis qu'il avoit amené dans le sein de l'Eglise Anglicane un grand nombre de familles, qui lui sont presentement fort attachées, & dont les ancêtres étoient autre fois Presbyteriens; & en meme tems il regardoit fixement le S^r St. Jean, qui est dans ce cas."¹⁰⁷

104 The Commons' bill and the Lords' amendments, with their reasons for them, were published on 24 February 1703. They can be seen in Select Documents for Queen Anne's Reign, ed. G. M. Trevelyan (Cambridge, 1929), pp. 25-40.

105 Luttrell, v, 244. For the voting during the committee see Carlisle Public Library, Bishop Nicolson's diaries, no. 1 B, 3, 4 and 9 December.

106 Lords' Journals, xvii, 185. The Lords also declared that any clause annexed to a bill of supply "is unparliamentary, and tends to the destruction of the constitution of this government". This was signed by no fewer than 63 peers. They included virtually every Whig in the house; no Tory signing this declaration. The declaration was originally passed by 51 to 47 votes. Carlisle Public Library. Bishop Nicolson's diaries, no. 1 B, 9 Dec. 1702. In the debates the earl of Sunderland claimed the bill had emanated from St. Germain's, the Pretender's Court, to divide the nation, but it was still supported by Leeds, Nottingham, and Normanby. Prussian Mss. 25 B, f. 313 v, and 25 C, f. 159. The dispatches of Bonet and Spanheim, both dated London, 11/22 Dec. 1702.

107 Ibid., 26 B, ff. 34 v-35. Bonet's dispatch to Berlin, 19/30 Jan. 1703.

St. John remained unabashed. The free conference proved abortive, even though a minority of Tory extremists, led by Seymour, Musgrave and Granville, tried to brow-beat the peers by suggesting that the malt tax should not be sent up to the Lords until they passed the Occasional Conformity bill.¹⁰⁸ The Commons insisted upon disagreeing with the Lords' amendments,¹⁰⁹ while their lordships voted, by 65 to 63, to preserve their amendments.¹¹⁰ The bill was therefore lost.

Despite this set-back the high Church Tories did not readily abandon their cherished bill. The Court used its influence to prevent the next session being disturbed by renewed disputes over the Occasional Conformity bill. Francis Atterbury was relieved that these moderate counsels had not prevailed: "Great endeavours are used to prevent the coming in of the bill against occasional conformity; and many members, who were zealous for it last session, are cooled in it. However, it will be brought in next week, and carried, though not with so high a hand as formerly."¹¹¹ Atterbury's prophecy was accurate. On 25 November the Commons discussed bringing in another Occasional Conformity bill. Sir Charles Hedges, secretary of state, tried to defer bringing in the bill, but on the other side "Mr. Bromley and St. John's speeches were much

108 Carlisle Public Library. Bishop Nicolson's diaries, no. 1 B, 15 Jan. 1702/3. The move was opposed by Harley, Howe, and other Tories.

109 Commons' Debates, iii, 217-43 gives a detailed account of the conference.

110 Luttrell, v, 258.

111 The Miscellaneous Works of Bishop Atterbury, ed. J. Nichols, i, 264. To Bishop Trelawny, 20 Nov. 1703.

admired."¹¹² Hedges was a moderate Tory and he was joined in opposition to bringing in the bill by other Court Tories like Jack Howe, James Brydges, and Thomas Coke.¹¹³ Godolphin and Harley worked hard to prevent the introduction of the bill. The lord treasurer informed Harley: "I have sent about severall of those you call orderly men; I have spoken to Mr. Lowndes to ply his coffee house & to diffuse. I have spoken very thorowly to Mr. Howe, myself; & to Mr. Bruer this morning, all appear to bee very well convinced of the unseasonableness of this bill; but all seem to bee apprehensive, the matter is too far engaged if once the bill comes into the house, & Mr. Bromley, by what I hear is obstinate to ye last degree."¹¹⁴ Nevertheless, the Commons voted, 173 to 130, to accept Bromley's motion in favour of another Occasional Conformity bill.¹¹⁵ It was again ordered that the bill should be prepared by Bromley, Annesley, and St. John. It would seem that St. John was still acting with the high Church Tories, though he was again showing signs that he would like to play the courtier. In the summer recess there had been strong rumours that St. John might be included in the entourage of the Archduke Charles,

112 Ibid., 1, 267-69. To Bishop Trelawny, 26 Nov. 1703.

113 Prussian Mss. 26 B, ff. 306-7. Bonet's dispatch, London, 26 Nov./7 Dec. 1703. For Brydges opposition to the bill see his letter to Lord Cutts, 22 Dec. 1703, in H.M.C., Frankland-Russell-Astley Mss., p. 153.

114 Longleat House. Portland papers. Misc. vol., ff. 209-10. Letter dated Tuesday, 9 Nov., at 6. [1703].

115 Commons' Journals, xiv, 238. The tellers for the minority were two Whigs, James Stanhope and Sir Richard Onslow, and for the majority two Tories, Sir Roger Mostyn and Charles Caesar.

when that Austrian claimant left to seize the Spanish throne. Erasmus Lewis wrote to Thomas Mansell: Mr. Nichols "told me in discourse that the Duke of Buckingham had a mind to make the first compliment to the Archduke, wch wou'd probably take the edge of Mr. St. Johns", and "St. Johns goes to Portugal, but whether 'tis in the room of Methuen or to attend the Archduke I can't tell".¹¹⁶ Nothing had come of these manoeuvres and so St. John continued his career as a leading Tory spokesman. Perhaps he believed that this was the best way to convince the Court of his worth, even if he was only considered of nuisance value.

The second Occasional Conformity bill was substantially the same as its predecessor, though the penalty for infringement was reduced to £50 and a conventicle was defined as a meeting of ten, not five, people. When the bill was committed on 30 November the voting was 210 to 132 in its favour,¹¹⁷ evidence that the confidence of the Tories was returning.¹¹⁸ During the committee stage the Whigs washed their hands of the bill, leaving the chamber and only returning for the divisions.¹¹⁹ During the third reading, however, the Whigs virtually monopolised the

116 National Library of Wales. Penrice and Margam Mss. L. 462 and L. 465. Letters of 8 and 10 July 1703.

117 Commons' Journals, xiv, 241. The tellers for the majority were the Tories, Sir Thomas Hanmer and one of the Grevilles, and for the minority two Whigs, Lord Hartington and Sir Walter Yonge.

118 For his comments on the revived Tory morale see Sir William Whitlock to Dr. Turner, 2 Dec. 1703. Bodleian Library. Rawlinson Ms. 92, f. 192.

119 B.M.Add.Ms. 17677, WWW, f. 415. L'Hermitage's dispatch, London, 14 Dec. 1703, n.s.

debate,¹²⁰ but could not prevent the bill passing by 223 to 140 votes
on 7 December.¹²¹ The Tories had succeeded quite well in the Commons,
but opposition to the bill was really only just beginning. Even a Tory
peer like the duke of Ormonde, who was later a Jacobite, had second
thoughts about the wisdom of bringing in the bill at this juncture. To
Lord Coningsby he wrote: "I think the bringing in the Bill of Occasionall
Conformity very unserviceable at this time, for I think to unite the most
one can, our enemies abroad having had too great success this summer."¹²²
The Queen was irritated that the Tories should embarrass the ministry yet
again, but she could not bring herself to dislike the bill itself. John
Locke was informed: The Queen "I can assure you upon good evidence
declared in council yt she could not look upon those to be her friends yt
should again promote it."¹²³ Once the bill had passed the Commons the
Queen was prepared to leave for Windsor so that Prince George could not
vote for the bill, but she had to admit to Lady Marlborough: "I shall
not have the worse opinion of any of the Lords that are for it; for
though I should have been very glad if it had not been brought into
House of Commons, because I would not have had any pretence given for
quarrelling, I can't help thinking now it is as good as passed there, it

120 Ibid., f. 418. L'Hermitage's dispatch, London, 18 Dec. 1703, n. s.,
and Prussian Mss., 26 B, f. 315, Bonet's dispatch, London, 7/18 Dec.
1703.

121 Commons' Journals, xiv, 246. The tellers were William Ashburnham and
Sir Christopher Hales for the majority, and Sir Charles Hotham and
Lord Mordaunt for the Whig minority.

122 H. M. C., Seventh Report, ii, app., p. 768. Letter dated Kilkenny,
26 Dec. 1703.

123 Bodleian Library. Locke Ms. c. 7, f. 7 v. From A. Collins, 18 Nov.
1703.

will be better for the service to have it pass the House of Lords too."124

The Tories nevertheless began to fear that the bill might be defeated in the Lords. Christopher Hatton informed Lord Hatton of the growing hesitation among the Tory M.P.s:

"Mr. Verney desires me to acquaint your Lordship that by great management their House is adjourned till next Tuesday for my Lord Whar[ton] had brag'd that by proxies his party was now able to fling out ye Bill agt Occasional Communion shou'd it be now sent up. Therefore Mr. Bromley, who was to carry up ye Bill, absented himself yesterday and this day Sir Ric[har]d Onslow moved to have the Bill carryed up wch occasion'd a very long debate whither according to ye regular proceedings in Parliament it ought not to be carryed up as soon as ye person was nam'd to carry it up and to prevent ye carrying it up immediatly, upon ye motion of Sir Edw[ard] Seymour ye House adjourn'd till next Tuesday."125

Seymour admitted that the adjournment was to be used to bring up more Tory
126

peers. The earl of Rochester tried in vain to persuade Prince George

127
to attend the House and support the bill. The Tory leaders could not

long delay the introduction of the bill into the Lords without further

damaging the morale of their supporters. On 14 December the bill was

taken to the upper House. There its specific terms were attacked by

124 Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne, ed. Beatrice Curtis Brown, p. 129. Letter dated Friday morning [Dec. 1703].

125 B. M. Add. Ms. 29576, f. 150. Letter dated 9 Dec. 1703. See also The Miscellaneous Works of Bishop Atterbury, ed. J. Nichols, i, 272. To Bishop Trelawny, Chelsea, 9 Dec. 1703. The vote in the Commons on 9 December was 181 to 143. The tellers were Sir Roger Mostyn and William Fytche, both Tories, for the majority, and Henry Brett, a Court Tory, and William Walsh, a Junto Whig, for the minority. Commons' Journals, xiv, 249.

126 Prussian Mss. 26 B, f. 319 v. Bonet's dispatch, London, 10/21 Dec. 1703.

127 Ibid. 26 B, f. 327. Bonet's dispatch, London, 17/28 Dec. 1703.

Bishop Burnet, though Haversham expressed a more typical view when he claimed "it could never have come in a more unseasonable and more dangerous Juncture."¹²⁸ The bill was rejected at its first reading by 71 to 59 votes.¹²⁹ Marlborough and Godolphin voted for it, and even signed the protest, but this was in order to forestall any criticism by Rochester that they were betraying their Tory principles. They had done nothing, however, to persuade any of their friends to join with them in voting for the bill.¹³⁰

St. John had again played a prominent rôle in a partisan Tory measure. Yet he had occasionally shown signs of moderation and of desiring to be well in with the Court. He had been thought of as an admirer of Marlborough, but there had been times when he helped to embarrass the ministry. His erratic conduct puzzled even his friends. Sir William Trumbull was told: "I was assured positively yesterday that while St. John pretends to be of D[uke] M[arlborough]'s party, he is his determined enemy, and that his seeming to be his friend does great hurt by deceiving many who else would not join with him; you may guess better than I, but my Author was good, and no doubt he holds himself at a very high price."¹³¹ The last remark appears to hold the key to St. John's

128 Lords' Debates, 11, 64.

129 Ibid., 11, 69-70.

130 Coxe, 1, 297. Marlborough to his wife, [Dec. 1703].

131 H. M. C., Downshire Mss., I, 11, 818. Anon. letter, dated 23 Dec. 1703. On an earlier letter to him Trumbull had listed a secret committee of the Commons, which included leading Tories and Court Tories. He wrote the names of St. John, Misgrave, Harcourt, Byerley, Mostyn, Copley, Powys, Coke, Grahme, Howe, Whitlocke, and Mackworth. Ibid., I, 11, 817. — to Trumbull, 17 Dec. 1703

actions in the 1703-4 session. He was ambitious for a ministerial post and anxious to serve Marlborough so he proved his value to the ministry by showing how dangerous he was when working with the Tory extremists. His support of the second Occasional Conformity bill was his last action in conjunction with Bromley and the high-fliers for several years. If his desire for office bespeaks the adventurer, at least he wanted to serve an administration that was still ostensibly Tory. His actions speak well for his political judgment. He had accurately judged the drift of support away from the high Church Tories and towards the Court.

Marlborough and Godolphin had long been furious with the Tory leaders. Early in 1703 they had persuaded the Queen to order Rochester to Ireland, where he was supposed to be lord lieutenant. Rochester told the Queen that he would rather resign than give up the leadership of his party in parliament, and the Queen accepted his resignation.¹³² When the second session of parliament had opened on 9 November 1703 the Queen had declared: "I want Words to express to you my earnest Desire of seeing all my Subjects in perfect Peace and Union among themselves; I have nothing so much at heart as their Welfare and Happiness: Let me therefore desire you all, That you would carefully avoid any Heats or Divisions that may disappoint me of that Satisfaction, and give¹³³ Encouragement to the common Enemies of our Church and State." The

132 Onno Klopp, Der Fall des Hauses Stuart (Wien, 1881-3), x, 235-36, citing Hoffmann's report.

133 Commons' Journals, xiv, 211.

Queen's attitude towards the second Occasional Conformity bill showed that she was becoming exasperated with the high Church Tories. The ministry had worked to win over the more moderate Tories, and had converted Jack Howe and Sir Charles Hedges, the latter being a close friend of Nottingham. Robert Harley had been the principal agent in managing the Commons.

St. John had been on friendly terms with him for some time and they had continued to meet even when on opposite sides in the Commons.¹³⁴ Harley began to convert St. John to more moderate policies, or perhaps he learned St. John's price. Sir William Trumbull too may have tried to guide St. John away from the extreme Tories. At least this would provide a suitable explanation of a letter he received in December 1703: "I hope you are well satisfied with yesterday's event Pray take your coach and try all your skill and interest to persuade all you have hope of to break from that insolent party, if they should propose any extravagant thing; it would be very happy if the party would break so as the Queen and nation might be sure of a majority in what was for the common interest; why won't you go where you said you would, and encourage in well-doing?"¹³⁵

134 St. John wrote to and visited Harley in 1703-4. See, for example, Berkshire Record Office, Downshire papers, Trumbull Add. Mss. 133, letter 15, St. John to Trumbull, 28 May 1703; H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 55-56, St. John to Harley, 25 Sept. 1703; and H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 79. Charles Davenant to Harley, 31 Jan. 1703/4.

135 H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 817. — to Trumbull, 15 Dec. 1703.

St. John had revealed his friendship for Harley and his admiration for Marlborough. He had also shown what a dangerous opponent he could be. Having posed as a threat to the ministry he then showed that he could be an accommodating colleague. In the early months of 1704 he began to illustrate his capacity for moderation. His stance in the Aylesbury election case had been that of an independent Tory, free from spleen, but determined to uphold the liberties of the Commons. Also, in late January 1704, he refused to join those factious Tories, who attempted to delay a money bill merely out of pique at the Lords' behaviour over the Occasional Conformity bill. On this issue St. John, and such former Tory stalwarts as Misgrave and Howe, helped to defeat the motion by 185 to 71¹³⁶ votes. Even more revealing was St. John's volte-face on the investigation of the alleged financial misdemeanours in the reign of William III. In February 1704 the Commons had again chosen seven commissioners of accounts and once more they elected leading Tories, namely Arthur Annesley, William Bromley, Robert Byerley, Sir Godfrey Copley, Sir William Drake, Henry Pinnell, and Francis Scobell. This time St. John was not one of the commissioners. He had specifically declined the¹³⁷ honour. This was a wise move if he intended to please the Court. The commissioners charged the earl of Ranelagh with misappropriating £72,000 of¹³⁸ the public money and addressed the Queen that he should be prosecuted.

136 B.M. Lansdowne Ms. 773, f. 6. Charles Davenant to his son, 1 Feb. 1703/4.

137 Luttrell, v, 395. 26 Feb. 1704.

138 Ibid., v, 399.

This embroiled them with the Lords, who objected to the Commons' choice of commissioners. They took exception to Byerley, who had been a colonel and who had not yet cleared the accounts of his own regiment, and wished to replace him with two men who were not even M.P.s. ¹³⁹ "'Tis thought," Lady Rachel Russell wrote, "this will be a great warme day in the House of Commons, the provocation is the Lords having put out Byerly as being to account for himselfe, and soe not fitt to be among the accountants, and have added Sir William Scawen and two others." ¹⁴⁰ The Commons objected ¹⁴¹ to these alterations and a free conference on 3 April proved abortive. Next day the Queen prorogued the session, just in time to avoid further trouble. Richard Hill learned:

"When the black-rod came to the door of the Commons, with her Majesty's commands for them to attend her in the House of Lords, they were very busy in directing their Speaker to address himself to the throne, and protest, in the name of all the Commons of England, against some of the Lords' proceedings; but they had not time to go through with it; so they are quietly (though discontentedly) returning home to their several countries. The sober party seem to be well pleased and in humour, the others not so, being under apprehension of alterations." ¹⁴²

While St. John was trimming his sails in the direction of the Court the two royal favourites, Marlborough and Godolphin, had been laying the blame for the ministry's difficulties in parliament at the door of

¹³⁹ Burnet, v, 112.

¹⁴⁰ H.M.C., Rutland Mss., 11, 180. To Lady Granby, 18 March 1703/4.
Sir William Scawen was a Whig.

¹⁴¹ Luttrell, v, 409-410.

¹⁴² The Diplomatic Correspondence of the Right Hon. Richard Hill, ed. W. Blackley (London, 1845), 1, 95. J. Tucker to Hill, Whitehall, 4 April 1704.

their Tory colleagues, Rochester and Nottingham. They had already ousted Rochester and they began to see that they could not co-operate much longer with Nottingham. The earl had carried his support for the Occasional Conformity bill to great lengths. Not content with voting for it in December 1703, he had connived at an announcement of its introduction in the Gazette of 23 November.¹⁴³ The Tory leader's final breach with Marlborough and Godolphin came over the Scotch Plot.¹⁴⁴ This complicated Jacobite intrigue embarrassed the ministry by bringing the two parties and the two chambers into conflict. The Whigs in the Lords expressed dissatisfaction with Nottingham's handling of the case,¹⁴⁵ in his capacity as secretary of state, and they decided on a committee to examine the Jacobite prisoners. The elected committee was composed of seven Whigs - Devonshire, Scarborough, Somers, Somerset, Sunderland, Townshend, and Wharton.¹⁴⁶ The investigation was now becoming a party issue. As a result the Tory majority in the Commons began to take notice of

143 Coxe, i, 218.

144 In 1702 Simon Fraser, a Jacobite, had landed in Scotland from France. He had contacted various Scots, including Atholl and Queensberry, with a view to tempting them to commit treason in the Pretender's cause. Both these Scottish peers had contacted the ministry in London and accused the other of embarking upon Jacobite intrigues. Sir John Maclean, followed by Boucher and Ogilby, were arrested and Nottingham began to interrogate them.

145 On 15 Dec. 1703 the Lords had tried to open their own investigation, but the Queen did not wish to have matters taken out of Nottingham's hands. Lords' Journals, xvii, 349 and 351.

146 Ibid., xvii, 353. Scarborough, with 46 votes, had come bottom of the list, but Godolphin had secured 27 votes, Marlborough 25 votes, and Nottingham a bare 10 votes. Onno Klopp, Der Fall des Hauses Stuart, xi, 16. Hoffmann's report of 20 Dec./1 Jan. 1703/4.

developments. On 20 December 1703 the Commons resolved to appoint a committee to draw up an address to the Queen "setting forth the great Concern this House hath for her Majesty's royal Prerogative, and the Resolution of this House to support the same; and that no Persons accused for Crimes, who are her Majesty's Prisoners, ought to be taken out of the Custody of the Crown without her Majesty's Leave." ¹⁴⁷ The ¹⁴⁸ committee was overwhelmingly Tory, and included Henry St. John. In fact it was Henry St. John who reported the address the next day. Though he was angling for a ministerial post he could not come to terms with the Whigs. Besides the ministry was also opposed to the conduct of the Lords.

The Commons' address was critical of the Lords for wresting prisoners out of royal custody, without leave, and asserted the royal prerogative over the prisoners. The address was passed by 180 to 142 ¹⁴⁹ votes. It was also resolved "that the Earl of Nottingham, one of her

147 Commons' Journals, xiv, 257.

148 Ibid. Thirty members were appointed to the committee. Only two, Sir Richard Onslow and John Smith, were Whigs. All the rest were staunch Tories. Besides St. John there were Jack Howe, William Bromley, Sir Simon Harcourt, Sir Edward Seymour, Sir Christopher Musgrave, Sir Thomas Hanmer, Arthur Annesley, Sir Roger Mostyn, Charles Caesar, Francis Gwyn, Robert Byerley, and John Manley - all the leading Tories.

149 Ibid., xiv, 259. The tellers for the majority were Richard Goulston and William Levinz, both Tories, and for the minority, Sir Charles Turner and one of the Onslows, both Whigs.

Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, for his great Abilities and Diligence in the Execution of his Office, for his unquestionable Fidelity to the Queen, and her Government, and for his steady adhering to the Church of England, as by Law established, hath highly merited the Trust her Majesty hath reposed in him." ¹⁵⁰ John Verney, a Tory M.P., was delighted with this vote: "I rejoice in this piece of justice don to one that has served in his station with as much sufficiency and fidelity as ever any man did and has had the misfortune to have a great party of men continually employed to traduce him." ¹⁵¹ On 17 January the Lords ¹⁵² presented a lengthy representation against the Commons' address, and five days later the lower House replied by selecting eleven members to search for precedents in cases where the Lords had committed persons in custody of the Crown. Henry St. John was again one of the Tories ¹⁵³ chosen. The Lords, after examining some papers the Queen had instructed Nottingham to lay before them, addressed her Majesty to prosecute Boucher. ¹⁵⁴ On 3 February a committee was appointed to draw up

150 Ibid., xiv, 260.

151 B.M. Add. Ms. 29,568, f. 154. To Lord Hatton, 21 Dec. 1703.

152 Lords' Journals, xvii, 371-74.

153 Commons' Journals, xiv, 298. The other ten, all Tories, were Arthur Annesley, William Bromley, Thomas Conyers, Sir Godfrey Copley, Sir William Drake, John Manley, Henry Pooley, John Toke, Sir Joseph Tredenham, and [Horatio?] Walpole.

154 Lords' Journals, xvii, 389. 29 Jan. 1704.

a counter-address to the Lords' earlier misrepresentations. Once more
155
St. John was one of those selected. A fortnight later the Commons
156
again took notice of the Lords' infringements of the royal prerogative.

Throughout February and March the Lords had the papers concerning the Scotch Plot laid before them. On 24 March a motion was made to censure Nottingham's narrative of the examination of Maclean as 'imperfect'. The move to put the question was defeated, which meant the Court peers must have supported the Tory minority. Twenty-two peers signed a protest; 157 they were all Whigs. Next day the Whigs did secure a resolution to the effect that not arresting and prosecuting Ferguson 'the plotter' was "of dangerous consequence." Twenty six peers signed a protest. They were 158 either Tories or Court supporters. On the 28th the Lords delivered a

155 Commons' Journals, xiv, 320. There were 32 on the committee. Only five were Whigs, Lord Coningsby, Lord Hartington, Sir Joseph Jekyll, Sir Richard Onslow, and Sir William St. Quintin. The Tories included, Annesley, Bromley, Mostyn, Misgrave, and Eyerley.

156 Ibid., xiv, 343-45. 18 Feb. 1704.

157 Lords' Journals, xvii, 523-24. The dissenting peers were Abergavenny, Bolton, Carlisle, Derby, Essex, Grey, Halifax, Herbert, Manchester, Mohun, Orford, Richmond, Rivers, Rockingham, Scarborough, Somers, Somerset, Stamford, Sunderland, Torrington, Wharton, and Bishop Burnet.

158 Lords' Journals, xvii, 525. The dissenting peers were Abingdon, Bedford, Bradford, Bridgewater, Buckingham, Caernarvon, Conway, Dartmouth, Denbigh, Gower, Granville, Guernsey, Guilford, Jersey, Lempster, Marlborough, North and Grey, Nottingham, Rochester, Scarsdale, Stawell, Winchelsea, and the bishops of Durham, London, Bath and Wells, and Peterborough. Only four of these were Whigs; Bedford, Bradford, Bridgewater, and the bishop of Peterborough. They may have had their own personal reasons for supporting the Court on this occasion; Bedford had been made a K. G. in 1703, Bradford was made lord lieutenant of Shropshire in 1704, Bridgewater was married to Marlborough's daughter, and the bishop was well known for his liberal attitude.

final address to the Queen defending all their actions.¹⁵⁹ Nottingham was furious at what he regarded as a slur on his reputation. In revenge he demanded that all those Whigs still in high office should be turned out. Lord Treasurer Godolphin told the duchess of Marlborough of his interview with the angry secretary of state:

"By these safe hands I may tell you I have had a very long conversation with Lord Nottingham..... there was very plain dealing on both sides, & of his side many threatenings from the Torys intermingled with professions to mee, his Aim seem'd to bee to gett the D. of Somersett & the Archbishop out of ye Cab[inet] Councill, and Lord Carlisle out of the Lieutenancy, he was very positive that the Queen could not govern but by one party or the other, and that keeping the D. of Som[erset] in ye Cab[inet] Councill after what had past would render her Government contemptible."¹⁶⁰

The disputes between the two parties and between the two houses of parliament were such that Marlborough and Godolphin could at last convince the Queen of the need to make governmental changes. The changes they envisaged were not those Nottingham had in mind. On the contrary the Queen's favourites regarded the high Tories as responsible for most of the ministry's difficulties. They were not willing to rush into the arms of the Whigs, for they believed they could win over a majority of the Tories from the factious policies of their leaders. Indeed they were already having considerable success. One of the veteran high Tory leaders, Sir Christopher Musgrave, had given several signs of supporting the Court against his former friends. He now gave an excellent demonstration of his

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, xvii, 538-41.

¹⁶⁰ Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. E. 20. Letter dated 18 April 1704.

change of heart when he obstructed the intended protestation of the Commons at the Lords' proceedings over the Scotch Plot long enough to
161
allow the Queen to prorogue the House.

Henry St. John had also been veering towards the Court in recent weeks and he was now within sight of his goal. The Queen finally accepted Nottingham's resignation rather than his ultimatum, but not before she had removed several of his Tory colleagues. Lord Jersey and Sir Edward Seymour were dismissed and William Blathwayt was removed. The replacements were mainly Tories, but they were men who had shown a
162
willingness to moderate their conduct to the interests of the Court. The marquis of Kent, a moderate Whig, replaced Jersey, Thomas Mansell, a moderate Tory, took Seymour's^{post} and, after some reluctance,
163
Harley became secretary of state. St. John at last gained his reward; he was made secretary at war in place of Blathwayt. He owed his place to the good offices of Harley and the great influence of Marlborough. St. John had associated with Harley since he entered parliament. He had several connections with Marlborough. The general's father, Sir Winston Churchill,

161 Bodleian Library. Ballard Ms. 6, f. 93. Edmund Gibson to Dr. Charlett, Lambeth, 25 April 1704. Cf. Ibid., Ballard Ms. 11, f. 172. E. Warcup to Dr. Charlett, 21 May 1703/4.

162 "'Tis not taken that this is a change from Tories to Whiggs, but from violence to moderation." Dr. Charles Davenant to his son, Harry, 21 April 1704. B.M. Lansdowne Ms. 773, f. 29 v.

163 Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers. Trumbull Add. Mss. 133, letter 30. St. John to Trumbull, 20 May 1704.

had once lived at Wootton Bassett, St. John's constituency. One of Marlborough's favourite generals was Lord Cutts, a kinsman of St. John. The new secretary at war may also have owed much to his old patron, Sir William Trumbull, who was on friendly terms with the duchess of Marlborough. Some time later St. John attributed his promotion to Trumbull's influence with Marlborough: "I am chiefly engag'd to you, who first gave him impressions that he has been good enough to retain." ¹⁶⁴ It was probably more true to say that St. John owed his new place to his own abilities. In a few short years he had pushed his way into the front ranks in the Commons, and not only among the less talented Tory members. His decision to take office was received with some satisfaction by the ministry. A potentially dangerous opponent had been muzzled rather than a client rewarded.

Once he had taken office St. John was anxious to end his association with the extreme Tories. To Sir William Trumbull he commented:

"The Town was a good deal surpriz'd att what happen'd to Id. Jersey, ... What is meant by it, especially considering he had no warning of ye blow first, nor reason for it afterwards given him, it is hard to say, but this in general I fancy. He was as deeply engag'd as he could well be in that Caball who were resolv'd to draw ye Queen and her Ministers into their measures & consequently into their power; this gang was to be broken & disabled. He was ye first victim. Nottingham sacrific'd himself because his point could not be carryed, & I only wonder it has not gone a little further." ¹⁶⁵

164 Ibid, letter 35. To Trumbull, 7 June 1706.
165 Ibid, letter 28. To Trumbull, 9 May 1704.

He believed, with some justice, that the change was merely to more moderate counsels and not to the Whigs. Many of his friends and former colleagues were in the ministry with him. Robert Harley was secretary of state as well as Speaker, Sir Christopher Musgrave was a teller of the exchequer, Jack Howe was paymaster of the guards and garrisons, Sir Simon Harcourt was solicitor-general, and Thomas Mansell was the new comptroller of the household. Several of St. John's cronies and fellow-rakes were also holding places under the Crown: James Brydges, a member of Prince George's admiralty council, soon became paymaster-general of the forces abroad; Thomas Coke was vice-chamberlain of the household; and Arthur Moore had just become a comptroller of army accounts. Nevertheless there was a trace of special pleading in the explanations he gave Sir William Trumbull:

"It is plain enough that we are far from being in a whig interest. Hands have been chang'd, but they have been such, to speak freely, as struggled not for ye Church of Eng[land] party, but to vest ye power in a caball that styl'd themselves so. There is a good deal of jealousy & dissatisfaction alive among some of our friends, and art & industry have not been wanting to inflame, but when by ye whole tenour of ye Queen's conduct they see their apprehensions were without foundation, they will certainly discover that the dispute was for persons & not for things."166

There was some truth in these remarks, but they look strange coming from St. John. He had abandoned the high Tories with a vengeance. In a letter, bordering on the hypocritical, he criticised the way the support

166 Ibid., letter 29. To Trumbull, 16 May 1704.

for the Occasional Conformity bill had been taken to extreme lengths and he expressed his opposition to any plan to reintroduce it at the present juncture: "As long as we are in such nice & dangerous circumstances, & that bringing in this Bill can only Serve for to rally & unite the whig party, & joyn with them in the most violent manner ye whole Herd of Fanaticks, as long as ye ministry must have the odium of our priests for not carrying what is impossible for them to do, why not delay that than
167
confound all to no purpose whatsoever."

During the summer recess the Court's pro-war policy received a tremendous fillip from the great successes abroad. On the Danube the duke of Marlborough fought a magnificent summer campaign, which culminated in the great victory at Blenheim. At sea Admiral Rooke's expedition captured Gibraltar. Throughout the summer months Marlborough's successes were rightly seen in England as transforming the political scene. For a time it made nonsense of the Tory opposition to the war. Thomas Coke told the great commander: "The country gentlemen, who have so long groaned under the weight of four shillings in the pound, without hearing of a town taken or an enterprise endeavoured, seem every day more chearfull in this warr, when no summer has passed, but some towns have submitted to
168
the English arms." Godolphin wrote delightedly to Seafield in Scotland: "The Duke of Marlborough's victory at Donawerdt has pretty well tamed the

167 Ibid., letter 32. To Trumbull, 30 May 1704.

168 H. M. C., Cowper Mss., iii, 38. Letter dated London, 20 June 1704.

opposition of England."¹⁶⁹ Harley explained to Marlborough: "I heartily wish yr Grace a series of success wch is so necessary for all our affairs abroad, & will make our winter campaign at home less difficult. The angry people here find the ground begins to fall from under them, & that those who us'd to follow them will not run mad with them."¹⁷⁰ Blenheim was the crowning glory. At sea, however, Rooke had captured Gibraltar and forced the French to return to Toulon after the battle of Malaga. The Tories tried to make Rooke's successes outshine those of Marlborough. In contrast, the Whigs were somewhat critical of Rooke's conduct in the drawn battle of Malaga. St. John, while triumphing in Marlborough's achievements, paid tribute to the Tory admiral and refuted the Whig criticisms: "The French are cowed and dejected by the defeats they have received this year to a degree that is not to be expressed. Sir George Rooke has done an action which all the world ought to admire, and which the generality believe."¹⁷¹

The high Church Tories remained intransigent. It was soon evident that they proposed to carry affairs to extremes in the new session. Henry St. John co-operated with Robert Harley and the other ministers in stressing the need for moderation. In October 1704 he requested the assistance of Sir William Trumbull: "The meeting of Parliament comes on

169 H. M. C., Fourteenth Report, app. 111, 203. Letter dated 13 July 1704.
170 Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. F 2-16. Letter dated 18 July 1704.

171 H. M. C., Cowper Mss., 111, 49. To Thomas Coke, Whitehall, 10 Oct. 1704.

apace and though there is inclination enough to do mischief, and there have been several meetings for this good purpose, I really am sanguine enough to expect the public business will be vigorously carried on, and our private feuds of no consequence. But for God's sake come up yourself and if you will not appear on the stage, advise, like an old actor, those that do. I expect you with impatience." ¹⁷² To his fellow rake and colleague, Thomas Coke, he wrote in similar terms: "For God's sake do not at farthest stay longer than Sunday, because it is most certain our patriots design some gallant thing to open the session with, and that is what, out of kindness to them, everyone should oppose. Though I believe in a little time all the endeavours of their friends to keep 'em on their legs will prove ineffectual." ¹⁷³

The first attack was expected to be against Harley, as Speaker, for his share in the late ministerial changes. Spencer Compton informed Robert Walpole: "I have inquir'd whether there wd be any attack on the Speaker at the opening of the Sessions and am inform'd that there is a general summons to all Mr. Bromley's Friends to attend the first day, which looks very like it." ¹⁷⁴ When parliament opened on 24 October the Queen remarked on the great successes abroad and urged unity at home. ¹⁷⁵

172 H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 836. Letter dated Whitehall, Oct. 1704.
 173 H.M.C., Cowper Mss., iii, 49. Letter dated Whitehall, 16 Oct. 1704.
 174 Cambridge University Library. Cholmondeley (Houghton) Mss. Letter 359. Letter dated 14 Oct. 1704. Cf. H.M.C., Cowper Mss., iii, 50. W. Stratford to Thos. Coke, 17 Oct. [1704].
 175 Commons' Debates, iii, 392-93.

The planned attack on Harley did not materialise after the high Tories
¹⁷⁶
saw that it would not command enough support. Nevertheless, the high
Church Tories planned to introduce a third Occasional Conformity bill.
Perhaps they felt it was still possible to win over Tories, like St. John,
who were known to support the bill, though they might support the Court on
other issues. They were prepared to use any means to secure their
cherished bill and to reassert their hold over the Tory majority in the
Commons. The first plan was simply to delay voting supplies until the
¹⁷⁷
bill had been passed, but then it was decided to 'tack' the Occasional
Conformity bill to the land tax bill in order to ensure the former's
¹⁷⁸
acceptance by the Lords. Harley calculated that he could defeat the

176 "The party yt intended to throw the Secretary out of ye chair, found
'temselves too weak, and did not attempt it, however Sir Humphrey
Mackworth gave broad hints yt he hop'd to bring it about in a few
days." B.M. Add. Ms. 7078, f. 223. — to Stepney, Whitehall, 24 Oct.
1704.

177 H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 64. Godolphin to Harley, 8 Nov. 1704.

178 It has been suggested that Robert Harley deliberately instigated the
'tack' to lead the Tories into discrediting themselves. See Abel
Boyer, An Impartial History of the Occasional Conformity and Schism
Bills (London, 1717), p. 63, and The Works and Life of Charles,
late Earl of Halifax (London, 1715), p. 110. Daniel Defoe had
suggested something on these lines to Harley. The Letters of Daniel
Defoe, ed. G. H. Healey (Oxford, 1955), p. 69. Letter dated 2 Nov.
1704. Yet the high Tory plan to oust Harley from the Speakership
suggests that they did not trust him and would not follow his advice.
Moreover his list of Tories, whom he hoped to persuade to oppose the
tack, would certainly suggest that the Tories could hardly be under
the illusion that Harley had ever supported their dangerous plan.
P. M. Ansell, 'Harley's Parliamentary Management', Bull. Inst. Hist. Res.
(1961), xxxiv, 92-97.

bill, especially after the great struggle that emerged over the introduction of the bill, and he did not expect the Tories to go so far as to tack it to the land tax. On 14 November he wrote to Marlborough: "It was carried for bringing in the bill by 26 votes, whereas last year it was 43, but I think it will be impossible for them to tack it if they be mad enough to attempt it." ¹⁷⁹ The vote to introduce the bill was 152-126, ¹⁸⁰ with St. John expressing the hope that nothing should delay the voting of ¹⁸¹ supplies for the war effort.

Harley's ministerial colleagues did not share his confidence. Harcourt, a Tory himself, protested: "Universal madness reigns. The more Inquiry I make concerning the occasional Bill, the more I am confirmed in my opinion that if much more care than has been be not taken, that Bill will be consolidated. I find the utmost endeavours have been used on one ¹⁸² side, and little or none on the other." If this charge of negligence was true when the letter was written, Harley soon remedied the situation. On that very letter he began to calculate which members could be counted

179 Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. F 2 : 16.

180 Commons' Journals, xiv, 419. The tellers for the majority were two Tories, Sir Thomas Hanmer and Charles Caesar, and for the minority were two Whigs, Robert Walpole and Sir Charles Hotham. Bromley, Annesley, and this time John Ward, were ordered to prepare the bill.

181 Prussian Mss., 27, f. 130. Spanheim's dispatch, 17/28 Nov. 1704.

182 B.M. Portland loan, 29/138/5. To Harley, 18 Nov. 1704.

upon by the Court and who would need persuading by one of the Court
183 party. He and Godolphin hoped that many Tories would be alienated by
the violence of their friends. The lord treasurer wrote to Harley: "I
wish both Mr. Solicitor [Harcourt] & Mr. St. John had been sensible a
little sooner, that they must not expect any quarter from their old friends
184 unless they goe along with them in everything." In another letter he
expressed approval of Harley's handling of the crisis: "You can't bee
possibly more in ye right than to encourage those who were agst. the Tack.
185 I hope you will bid everybody doe it."

The third Occasional Conformity bill was deliberately more
moderate than either of its predecessors. It incorporated some of the
Lords' amendments of 1702: a time limit was imposed on bringing a
prosecution after the alleged offence; the prosecution had to have the
sworn testimony of two witnesses; a Dissenter did not have to accept an
office offered to him; and hereditary office holders were allowed to
186 appoint deputies. These more moderate terms may have helped the bill
187 secure a second reading by 192 to 138 votes. It was a promising

-
- 183 P. M. Ansell, 'Harley's Parliamentary Management', Bull. Inst. Hist. Res.
(1961), xxxiv, 92-97.
184 Longleat House. Portland papers. Misc. vol. of Godolphin letters,
f. 199. To Harley, Sunday 19 at 2. [Nov. 1704].
185 Ibid., f. 140. To Harley, Wednesday at 8 [22 Nov. 1704?].
186 See P. M. Scholes, 'Parliament and the Protestant Dissenters, 1702-
1719', unpublished London M.A. thesis (1962), pp. 48-9.
187 Commons' Journals, xiv, 433. The tellers for the majority were two
Tories, Ralph Freeman and [Francis or Algernon] Greville.

majority, but the promoters of the bill still envisaged the need to tack it to the land tax bill to get it through the Lords. Harley and Godolphin worked feverishly to forestall the tack by persuading as many Tory members as possible of the foolishness of attempting such an extreme course when the war was going so well. Sir Charles Hedges, secretary of state, and William Lowndes, secretary to the treasury, canvassed their Tory friends. Prince George was asked to answer for his courtiers, and Harley, himself, was active among the members. St. John, too, was probably busy persuading his friends. At least one friend, Colonel James Grahme, was turned against the tack. Bishop Nicolson recorded: "In ye morning, first Mr. R. Musgrave, and (soon after) Coll. Graham, with assurances that neither of 'em would vote for Tacking ye Occasional [bill]. The former might possibly pay some deference to my opinion in this matter. But the latter (I was sensible) was entirely under ye Direction and influence of Mr. Sec. Harley." The canvassing by the Court was remarkably successful. On 28 November the tack was debated for no less than seven hours, but at the division it was heavily defeated by 251 to 134 votes. The Tories quickly reintroduced the Occasional Conformity

188 Longleat House. Portland papers. Misc. vol. of Godolphin letters, ff. 196 and 134. To Harley, Sat. at noon [25 Nov. 1704?] and Monday at 2 [27 Nov. 1704?].

189 Carlisle Public Library. Bishop Nicolson's diaries, no. 5, 28 Nov. 1704.

190 Carlisle Record Office. Lonsdale Mss. D/Lons., box 10. James Lowther to Sir John Lowther, Whitehall, 28 Nov. 1704.

191 Commons' Journals, xiv, 437. The tellers for this last ditch stand were William Bromley and Ralph Freeman. The tellers for the majority were two Whigs, Lord Coningsby and Sir Charles Hotham. The Court wished to remain in the background as far as was possible, and so not antagonise the 'tackers' too much.

bill by itself, to show that the supporters of it were not in a minority. They were correct. The bill passed its final reading by 178 to 131 votes
192 on 14 December. In the Lords the bill was supported by the leading Tory peers, including Nottingham, Rochester, Abingdon, Anglesey, Guernsey,
193 Winchelsea, Haversham, and the archbishop of York. Yet on 15 December
194 it was defeated on a motion to accord it a second reading.

The tack was one of the crucial party votes of the reign. It was on this rock that the flimsy and superficial unity of the Tory party was rudely shattered. It took four years to patch up the breach between moderate and high Church Tories, and another two years for the party to return to power. Yet even then the Tory party was still susceptible to divisions between the moderates and the extremists. Since the tack revealed the fundamental dichotomy in the Tory party it is important to analyse the vote on 28 November 1704. There are at least six different
195 versions of the lists of 'tackers', but taken together they produce only 136 names, which is two in excess of the actual voting figure given in the

192 Ibid., xiv, 459. The tellers for the majority were Arthur Annesley and Sir Christopher Hales, both 'tackers'. The tellers for the minority were Lord William Pawlett, a Whig, and Colonel Horatio Walpole, a Tory.

193 Carlisle Public Library. Bishop Nicolson's diaries, no. 5, 15 Dec. 1704.

194 Bishop Nicolson, ibid., gives the vote as 51 to 33, but Luttrell, v, 498, and Bodleian Library, Newdigate newsletters (microfilm), 297, 15 Dec. 1704, give the votes as 71 to 50. The latter may include the proxy votes.

195 W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-14. A Study in Political Organisation', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1965), pp. 102-108.

Commons' Journals. This suggests a high degree of accuracy in the lists. In the reign of Queen Anne these 136 M.P.s recorded 260 votes on the other nine extant voting lists. No less than 238 of these votes were on the Tory side, and a mere 22 against. Of these 22 votes one was Bromley's courtesy vote for John Smith in the contest for the Speakership in 1705 and another was cast by Nathaniel Herne, a London merchant, who opposed the South Sea bill in 1711. All the others could be classified as 'Whimsical' or 'Hanoverian' Tory votes. No less than seventeen were
196
against the Treaty of Commerce with France in 1713, and three of this group went on to oppose the expulsion of Richard Steele from the Commons
197
in 1714. There is no evidence of any of the Tackers becoming consistent allies of the Whigs. An analysis of the type of Tory, who voted for the 'tack', produces the expected picture. All four members,
198
representing the university seats, voted for the 'tack'. So did twenty
199
eight knights of the shire and forty two members from the five counties

196 Viz., Henry Bertie (Westbury), James Bertie, Sir James Etheredge, Ralph Freeman, Sir Thomas Hanmer, Frederick Herne, Nathaniel Herne, Wilfrid Lawson, William Levinz, Henry Manaton, Sir Roger Mostyn, Sir John Parsons, Peter Shakerley, Sir John Thorold, Sir George Warburton, John Ward [of Newton], and James Winstanley.

197 Lawson, Shakerley, and Thorold.

198 Arthur Annesley, William Bromley, Heneage Finch, and Sir William Whitlock.

199 Sir Charles Barrington (Essex), Thomas Chaffin (Dorset), John Curzon (Derbyshire), Lewis Dymocke (Lincolnshire), Lord Dysart (Suffolk), Ralph Freeman (Herts.), Henry Gorges (Herefordshire), Richard Halford (Rutlandshire), Sir Richard Howe (Wiltshire), Robert Hyde (Wiltshire), Sir Robert Jenkinson (Oxfordshire), Warwick Lake (Middlesex), Wilfrid Lawson (Cumberland), Sir Francis Leigh (Kent), Sir John Mordaunt (Warwickshire), Sir Roger Mostyn (Cheshire), Sir Edward Norreys (Oxon.), Sir John Pakington (Worcestershire), Granado Pigott (Cambridgeshire),

Cont'd

of the south west.²⁰⁰ Only nine of the 'tackers' were definitely connected with trade,²⁰¹ three of them with one of the big trading companies.²⁰² Twelve of the 'tackers' had been in the army, but only seven of these were serving officers²⁰³ in 1704. There were only two naval officers, one of them long since retired.²⁰⁴ The overwhelming impression from an analysis of the 'tackers' is that they were very much the representatives of the English squirearchy. It is unfortunate that there is no list, of comparable accuracy, of those who voted against the 'tack'. The lists of the opponents of the tack give more than eighty

Hugh Smithson (Middlesex), Sir John Stonehouse (Berkshire), Bertram Stote (Northumberland), Thomas Strangeways (Dorset), Sir John Thorold (Lincolnshire), Sir Richard Vyvian (Cornwall), Sir George Warburton (Cheshire), Leonard Wessell (Surrey), Sir John Williams (Herefordshire).

²⁰⁰ John Anstis, James Buller, William Cary, John Hoblyn, John Manley, William Pole, Henry Pooley, James Praed, John Rolle, Joseph Sawle, Francis Scobell, Charles Seymour, Henry Seymour, John Spark, and Sir Richard Vyvian [Cornwall]; Arthur Champneys, Thomas Coulson, Sir William Drake, Frederick and Nathaniel Herne, Henry Manaton, Sir Edward and William Seymour, and John Snell [Devon]; John Banks, Richard Bingham, Thomas Chaffin, Richard Fownes, and Henry Thynne [Dorset]; James Anderton, Sir Jacob Banks, William Coward, and Henry Portman [Somerset]; Henry and Robert Bertie, Henry Chivers, Charles Fox, William Harvey, Sir Richard Howe, Sir James Howe, Robert Hyde, and Henry Pinnell. [Wiltshire].

²⁰¹ Arthur Champneys, Thomas Coulson, Sir Robert Davers, Sir Samuel Garrard, Thomas Heath, Frederick and Nathaniel Herne, Sir John Parsons, and John Snell.

²⁰² Heath, and the two Hernes were connected with the East India Company.

²⁰³ Henry Bertie, William Cary, Robert Crawford, George Dashwood, Charles North, Charles and William Seymour, were serving officers. Robert Byerley, Henry Chivers, Sir Walter Clarges, and Henry Holmes were all retired, while Sir Henry Bellasysse had been disgraced in 1702.

²⁰⁴ Sir Jacob Banks, a retired officer, and Algernon Greville.

names in excess of the 251 who voted on 28 November.²⁰⁵ It would be very interesting to discover which Tories became 'sneakers' on this crucial issue. A list of the new members elected in the 1705 general election gives the names of twenty eight 'sneakers'.²⁰⁶ The list is unfortunately not particularly accurate. For instance it lists 28 'sneakers', but then claims there were thirty. Two of those classified as 'sneakers', Sir William Forester and Sir Charles Turner, were certainly Whigs, and John Brewer can hardly be counted as a Tory. Moreover this list appears to refer to those who voted against the tack, whereas the term 'sneaker' was usually used to denote those Tories who abstained. Twenty four of the members listed here as 'sneakers' probably opposed the tack. They include Edward, Thomas and Robert Harley, Simon Harcourt, George Granville, Richard Musgrave, and, of course, Henry St. John.²⁰⁷

The Tory party was seriously divided after the attempt to 'tack' the Occasional Conformity bill. The high Church Tories, led by William

205 Cobbett's Parliamentary History, vi, 362-67 and Commons' Debates, v, 125-35, both give a total of 334 voters against the 'tack'.

206 B.M. Stowe Mss. 354, ff. 161-2. 'A Numerical Calculation of the Honourable Mem—rs as were elected for the Ensuing Parl—nt', (London, 1705). Lord Cheney, that is William Cheyne, is mentioned twice so there are only 27 members named as 'sneakers'.

207 The other 17 members listed as 'sneakers' are Thomas Bliss, Thomas Cartwright, William Cheyne, Sir Francis Child, John Conyers, Thomas Conyers, Anthony Duncomb, Sir Charles Duncomb, Henry Hyde, Sir Justinian Isham, Sir Henry Johnson, William Johnson, Sir Thomas Meeres, Nathaniel Napier, Sir Thomas Powys, Sir Charles Shuckburgh, and Sir Joseph Tredenham. Only Tredenham did not record a Tory vote in Anne's reign, though he did in William III's reign.

Bromley, were discredited for having pushed their prejudices to extreme lengths, while many Tories, notably Harley, Harcourt and St. John, were confirmed in their loyalty to the Court. By Christmas 1704 the position of the high Church party was at its lowest ebb since Queen Anne ascended the throne. On 22 December Erasmus Lewis wrote to Henry Davenant: "The court would have had the adjournment only to the 2nd of Jan., but it was carried for the 8th. I mention this inconsiderable question because it is the only one that has been carried against the court this session."²⁰⁸ Dr. Smalridge bemoaned the state of the Tory party in the Commons: "I find our friends very much surprised & disturbed [that] the Party, wch some weeks ago found itself so strong, doth now upon all Divisions in the House appear so weak, as to be able to carry nothing wch they contend for. It is said, I hope without ground, that after the Parlt, is up, there will be great alterations in the disposal of places."²⁰⁹ In the Lords the situation was very much the same. According to Bonet, the Prussian agent, the upper chamber was divided into high Tories, led by Nottingham and Rochester, and a formidable combination of Court, moderate Tory, and Whig peers.²¹⁰ The high Tory peers attempted to embarrass the ministry by denouncing the Act of Security as endangering the Hanoverian succession in Scotland. Lord Haversham, supported by Nottingham and Rochester, urged the Lords to censure Godolphin for having persuaded the

208 B.M.Add.Ms. 4743, f. 19. Dated Whitehall, 22 Dec. 1704.

209 Bodleian Library. Ballard Ms. 7, f. 5 v. To Dr. Charlett, 24 Dec. 1704.

210 Prussian Mss. 28 A, f. 421 v. Dispatch to Berlin, dated London, 8/19 Dec. 1704.

Queen to sign this measure. The Whig Lord Halifax began to join in the attack on the lord treasurer, but his fellow Junto peer, Lord Wharton, after consulting with Godolphin, persuaded Halifax to moderate his language.²¹¹ Instead the Court, supported by the Whigs, proposed that commissioners should be appointed to negotiate a Treaty of Union with Scotland.²¹² To the Tory peers it must have been an ominous sign to see the Court allying with the Whigs.

After the Christmas recess the high Tories attempted to regain their hold over the rank and file and to boost their own morale by bringing forward popular issues. Once more the Aylesbury election case was revived to display the Tory zeal for the privileges of the house of Commons. Lord Wharton had persuaded some of the Aylesbury electors to prosecute the constable for infringing their voting rights. The Commons replied by arresting the electors for contempt, and on 24 February the House resolved to address the Queen on this breach of its privileges. The preparation of the address was referred to a committee composed of three political groups - William Bromley and Sir William Whitlock for the high Tories, Henry St. John and Simon Harcourt for the Court Tories, and

²¹¹ Burnet, v, 179.

²¹² Boyer's Annals, iii, 159-164. L'Hermitage reported that the Tories had planned to embarrass the ministry by voting to bring over the Princess Sophia, which was anathema to Queen Anne, but the disputes over Scottish affairs prevented the motion being debated. B.M.Add. Ms. 17677, 22, f. 532. Dispatch dated London, 23 Dec. 1704.

Sir Peter King and Sir Richard Onslow for the country Whigs.²¹³ The dispute with the Lords eventually led to another free conference on 8 March 1705. The managers for the Commons were William Bromley, John Brewer, John Comyns, Sir John Hawles, Sir Humphrey Mackworth, Henry Pooley, Sir Thomas Powys, and John Ward.²¹⁴ Brewer was a Court Tory, Hawles a Whig, and the other six were 'tackers'. Both Houses again refused to budge from their positions and no progress was made before parliament was dissolved. In January 1705 the high Tories had brought forward a place bill, a measure ever popular with the country gentlemen in the Commons. The bill, introduced by Ralph Freeman and supported by Annesley, Bromley, and Caesar, aimed primarily at excluding army officers from the House.²¹⁵ Place bills generally had widespread support and another bill, to eliminate those who held any offices created since February 1684, was brought in by the Country Whig, Sir Peter King.²¹⁶ On 27 January the first bill was narrowly defeated by 139 to 133 votes.²¹⁷ The Tory Lord Fermanagh expressed his disappointment to Thomas Cave: "I wish the bill ... had pass[ed] for now the Chu[rch] of Eng[land] is checkt every little sugar plum is pleasing to her Children."²¹⁸ Sir Peter King's bill was

213 Commons' Journals, xiv, 550.

214 Lords' Journals, xvii, 694.

215 Commons' Journals, xiv, 480.

216 Ibid.

217 Ibid., xiv, 499. The tellers for the majority were two Whigs, Lord Coningsby and Robert Walpole, and for the minority two Tories, Ralph Freeman and Charles Caesar.

218 Buckinghamshire Record Office. Verney Mss. (microfilm). Letter dated 4 Feb. 1704/5.

passed, but was amended by the Lords. The Commons disagreed with these changes and the bill was lost when parliament was dissolved.²¹⁹

Nevertheless, the place bills had done something to strengthen the position of the high Tories. Lord Cutts claimed that "Peter King and Ansley [Annesley], with Bromley, &c., are reconciled, and have shaken hands to stand by each other next winter to oppose the iniquity of the times and promote the public welfare."²²⁰

After the dissolution of parliament both sides prepared for the forthcoming general election. The Court sought to confirm its hold over the moderates by further changes. In March 1705 the moderate Whig, the duke of Newcastle, was made lord privy seal, and lords Peterborough and Cholmley were added to the privy council. Lord Granville lost his place as lieutenant general of the ordnance to the Whig Thomas Erle and the lord lieutenancy of Cornwall to Godolphin; Sir Roger Mostyn was replaced as constable of Flint castle by John Trevor, a Whig; Charles Bertie lost the treasurership of the ordnance to the Whig Henry Mordaunt; James Brydges, a Court Tory, became paymaster of the forces abroad; Admiral Rooke was removed from the Prince's admiralty council and Peter Shakerley, the tacker, lost his post as governor of Chester.²²¹ In the election campaign the Court made determined efforts to oust the tackers. Marlborough urged

219 See G. S. Holmes, 'The Attack on 'the influence of the Crown' 1702-16'. Bull.Inst.Hist.Res. (1966), xxxix, 52.

220 H.M.C., Frankland-Russell-Astley Mss., p. 176. To Col. Revett, 13 Mar. 1704/5.

221 Iuttrell, v, 531-40, and Elizabeth Cunningham, 'The General Election of 1705', unpublished London M.A. thesis (1939), pp. 13-19.

Godolphin: "As to what you say of the tackers, I think the answer and method that should be taken is what is practised in all armies, that is, if the enemy give no quarter, they should have none given to them."²²²

The lord treasurer's son contested the Cambridge University election against two tackers. The Whigs published blacklists of the tackers, as well as other broadsheets attacking the Tories.²²³ The tackers were at a serious disadvantage because of the popularity of the war. Robert Walpole was told: "Ye sooner ye Election ye better for peoples hearts are up by last years successes & are now angry at ye Tackers, but as ye Fortune of Warr is uncertaine a Reverse may soon happen so tis much better to improve ye present opportunity."²²⁴ The Tories replied with their favourite cry, 'the Church in danger'.²²⁵ This was always an effective rallying cry and, moreover, by the time of the general election the Tory morale had begun to revive.

222 Coxe, ii, 70. Letter dated 14 April 1705. Cf. Godolphin's letter to the duchess of Marlborough, no date, ibid., ii, 70-71.

223 A List of the Worthy Patriots who to prevent the Church of England from being undermined voted that the bill to prevent Occasional Conformity might be tackt to the Land-Tax bill (London, 1705); A Brief Account of the Tack, in a Letter to a Friend (London, 1705); A Serious Address to the Commoners of England, concerning the approaching Elections of Parliament (London, 1705); and, Some Plain Observations recommended ... to the Electors of Parliament (London, 1705).

224 Cambridge University Library. Cholmondeley (Houghton) Mss., letter 405. From John Turner, Lynn Regis, 19 Feb. 1704/5.

225 In reply to the Tory case in The Memorial of the Church of England Robert Harley employed John Toland to write The Memorial of the State of England (London, 1705). The Miscellaneous Works of John Toland, ed. Pierre Des Maizeaux (London, 1747), i, lix. Harley's influence can also be detected in the moderation urged by Defoe in Advice to all Parties (London, 1705).

Though some historians have claimed that the Whigs won the general election of 1705, the result in fact was very close. The Court certainly held the balance between the two parties. Godolphin later calculated that the 450 members, who had voted in the contest for the Speakership in 1705, could be divided into 190 Tories, 160 Whigs, and 100 Queen's servants, and therefore the Court could hold the balance.²²⁶ Bonet, the Prussian agent, thought the result was probably 230 Whigs, 200 high Tories, and the rest moderate Tories.²²⁷ L'Hermitage gave exactly the same result,²²⁸ while Hoffmann, the Austrian resident, was probably nearest the mark with an assessment of 273 Tories and 240 Whigs, but with the rider that 40 Tories would work with the Whigs.²²⁹ Yet another report suggested that "by the nearest computation can be made, the Whigs and Tories are equal so that the Placemen will turn the Balance."²³⁰ The Court, in fact, was not entirely satisfied with the close result. Marlborough wrote home to Godolphin:

"Upon my exsamaning the list you sent me of the new Parl: I find so great a number of Tackers and their adherents that I should have been very uneasy in my own mind, if I had not on this occasion beged of the Queen as I have in my letter that she would be pleas'd for Her own sake, and the good of Her Kingdom to advise early with you, what incoragement might be proper to give the whigs, that they

226 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 291. To Harley, 22 March 1705/6.

227 Prussian Mss. 30 A, f. 203. Dispatch dated London, 5/16 June 1705.

228 Heinsius Mss. no. 1034. Dispatch dated London, 9 June 1705.

229 Staatsarchiv Vienna. Karton 39, f. 78. Hoffmann's dispatch, dated London, 30 June 1705.

230 Nottingham University Library. Portland Mss. FWA. 410. Mr. Eyles to the duke of Portland, London, 25 July 1705.

might look upon it as their own concern to beat down and oppose all such proposals as may prove uneasy to Her Maty or government."²³¹

Here was a potential source of friction within the ministry, though it took time to mature. Marlborough was already seeing the need to make terms with the Whigs. Robert Harley, and no doubt Henry St. John, were hoping to work entirely with the moderate Tories:

"The composition of the Parl[iament] seems to be such that neither Party can carry any point against the other, by their own strength one sort of Gentleman have behav'd themselves so, that there remains very little room for debate which the Queen shoud make Hers, the care seems to be only that she may not be in the power of a Party; for there are indifferent and unlisted men enough who wil be content and zealous to promote the Queen's affaires, tho they see persons of a different Party from them employ'd."²³²

Henry St. John, having cut himself off from the high Tories, now saw his fortune allied with the careers of his two patrons and heroes, Harley and Marlborough. The secretary at war took a keen interest in those elections which particularly involved the great commander. He kept him informed of Cadogan's election at Woodstock, where Marlborough had a considerable interest, and congratulated him when some tackers were defeated.²³³ To Marlborough he appeared in the rôle of the moderate courtier, above party and faction: "The Torys look on themselves as

231 Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers, AI-37. Letter dated Lien les Beguines, 6 July 1705.

232 Ibid., AI-37. Harley to Marlborough, 6/17 July 1705 (copy).

233 Ibid., AI-20. St. John to Marlborough, Whitehall, 17, 30 April, 18 and 25 May 1705.

abandon'd, and ye whigs think their reward not proportionable to their merit, thus all party men are dissatisfied, and ever will be so under a wise administration." ²³⁴ He must have been gratified by Marlborough's interest in his own election. The general congratulated him upon his re-election at Wootton Bassett: I "am glad to hear of your success in your election. I suppose they are all over by this time, and hope we shall meet in the winter in a temper wholly inclined to promote the public service." ²³⁵ St. John did not desert the Tories entirely, however, and, like Harley, he was opposed to any drift towards the Whigs. When the Court candidate for Speaker was decided, and it emerged that the choice had fallen on John Smith, a Whig, St. John had genuine misgivings. "Her Majesty," he wrote to Marlborough, "having been pleas'd to direct her servants to promote all they can Mr. Smith's advancement to the chair of the House of Commons makes it too late for another. It had been happy if that could have been found whom ye whigs would have voted for, and who might have reconcil'd a great many of those people to him, that may cease to be Torys but never can become whigs." ²³⁶ Among the latter he would have included himself.

The morale of the Tories had revived after the general election and they planned a united front in the contest for the Speakership.

234 Ibid. Letter dated Whitehall, 30 April 1705.

235 The Letters and Dispatches of John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, ed. Sir George Murray (London, 1845), 1, 100. To St. John, camp at Elft, 13 June 1705.

236 Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers, AI-20. Letter dated Whitehall, 27 July 1705.

Lord Paget learned that "the High Ch[urch] party amongst us are very confident that Mr. Bromley will be chosen Speaker of the house of Commons, and the Earl of Dysert being last week at Stafford declared in much company that they are assured Mr. Bromley would be chosen, and that 250 members ingaged solemnly to appear the first day of the session and to vote for him." ²³⁷ Harley, after some misgivings about Smith as the Court candidate, worked to secure his election. ²³⁸ St. John's position was a little more difficult. He had been a friend and a colleague of Bromley more recently than Harley, but, charmed by the fruits of office, he silenced his own doubts and worked to convince some of his Tory friends that the Court was in the national interest. He hoped that Marlborough's successes abroad would "keep down ye ferment here, which rises apace, and promises a stormy winter." ²³⁹ Meanwhile he canvassed his friends to support the Court. To James Grahme he wrote: "Here are some thorough points to be managed very early which your assistance will be wanted in I can assure you Sir Roger [Harley], Sir William [Godolphin] & all yr friends expect you." ²⁴⁰ He was more explicit to Thomas Coke:

237 Mss. of Marquess of Anglesey at Plas Newydd (box 160). Cited by W. A. Speck, 'The Choice of a Speaker in 1705'. Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. (1964), xxxvii, 22.

238 Ibid., p. 27.

239 Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers, AI-20. St. John to Marlborough, Whitehall, 7/18 Aug. 1705.

240 Levens Hall Mss., box D, file S. Letter dated 25 Aug. 1705. At the same time the earl of Thanet was requesting Grahme to hurry to Westminster to support Bromley. Ibid., box D. Letter dated 25 Sept. 1705. In fact Grahme voted for Bromley and so St. John's approach was in vain.

"I should be glad to know what temper you find gentlemen in: whether they will think it reasonable to support the Queen, who has nothing to ask but what we are undone if we do not grant: and who, if she does make use of hands they do not like, has been forced to it by the indiscretions of our friends. The real foundation of difference between the two parties is removed, and she removes to throw herself on the gentlemen of England, who had much better have her at the head of 'em than any ringleaders of fashion. Unless gentlemen can show that her administration puts the Church or the State in danger, they must own the contest to be about persons: and if it be so, can any honest man hesitate which side to take."²⁴¹

In this instance St. John was preaching to the converted. Coke was a Tory courtier of longer standing than the secretary at war and he had no hesitation in voting for Smith. Indeed in 1710 he was prepared to vote for the impeachment of Sacheverell.

St. John's campaigning for the Court was cut short by illness. Three days after St. John had written to him Coke learned: "Mr. St. John is at present very ill of an ague and fever; but I hope the worst is over."²⁴² The secretary at war decided on a fortnight's convalescence on his Berkshire estate "to recover my health perfectly before our winter campagne begins, which will be warm, & give us trouble enough tho' without dispute ye publick service will prevail and ye Queen will obtain whatever she desires. It would be hard if she should not, when she has nothing to ask but what is our indispensable interest to grant."²⁴³ Coke learned

²⁴¹ H. M. C., Cowper Mss., 111, 63-64. Letter dated Whitehall, 19 Sept. 1705.

²⁴² Ibid., 111, 64. Samuel Lynn to Coke, 22 Sept. 1705. See also Anthony Hammond to Coke, 27 Sept. 1705, and Mrs. St. John to Coke, 29 Sept. 1705. Ibid., 111, 64-65.

²⁴³ Bodleian Library. Ms. Eng. Hist. d. 150, f. 41. St. John to Cardonnel, 1 Oct. 1705.

that his friend was rapidly regaining his strength and confidence:

"Henry St. John has indeed been in a great deal of danger, but I suppose by this time has himself given you an account of his recovery. He is now at Bucklebury, from whence he writes me word he gathers strength every day, and is preparing to encounter us in full strength and vigour about the sitting of Parliament."²⁴⁴

St. John's growing confidence was not really justified. On 11 October William Cowper, a less accommodating Whig than the duke of Newcastle, became lord keeper. When parliament met on the 25th there was a huge gathering of members and Smith was elected Speaker by 248 to 205 votes. Though the Court had achieved a satisfactory majority St. John could not have been really pleased with the actual voting. Smith was²⁴⁵ proposed and seconded by two Whigs, Lord Granby and Sir John Holland. Only Harley, among the Tories, spoke in favour of Smith, while Arthur Annesley, Sir Edward Seymour, Sir Thomas Hanmer, and Sir Roger Mostyn, all²⁴⁶ spoke up for William Bromley. More important the voting was very much on party lines. Not a single Whig supported Bromley, apart from Smith's courtesy vote, and most of the Tories who voted for Smith held places. No less than seventeen Queen's servants felt the pull of party too strongly to support the Court, and voted for Bromley. Only twenty seven Court or

244 H.M.C., Cowper Mss., iii, 65-66. George Granville to Thos Coke.
9 Oct. 1705.

245 Commons' Journals, xv, 5.

246 Cobbett's Parliamentary History, vi, 450.

moderate Tories voted for Smith,²⁴⁷ and even this figure could be
248 reduced.

The most important of these were Robert Harley, Henry St. John, and Sir Simon Harcourt. Their position was now equivocal and they could only hope that they would not be further compromised by the Court moving closer to the Whigs. For Harley the major task of the Court was to win over more of the Tories, especially the placemen who had deserted to Bromley. He told Marlborough of the contest for the Speakership:

247 W. A. Speck, 'The Choice of a Speaker in 1705', Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. (1964), xxxvii, 29-33. The twenty-seven Tories, who supported the Court, were Henry Brett, colonel of foot; Sir Godfrey Copley, comptroller of army accounts; Thomas Dodson, major; Anthony Duncombe, commissioner of prizes; William Ettrick, counsel to the admiralty; Sir William Gifford, commissioner of the navy; George Granville, governor of Pendennis; Sir Simon Harcourt, solicitor-general; Sir Charles Hedges, secretary of state; Thomas King, lieutenant-governor of Sheerness; Thomas Mansell, comptroller of the household; Thomas Medlycott, steward to the court of Westminster; Arthur Moore, comptroller of army accounts; John Mounsteven, commissioner of the royal tin farm; Edward Nicholas, treasurer to Prince George; Henry Paget, one of the prince's council; Edward Southwell, secretary of state in Ireland; Sir Joseph Tredenham, comptroller of army accounts; Charles Trelawny, governor of Plymouth; Edward Harley, auditor of the imprest; Robert Harley, secretary of state; and Henry St. John, secretary at war. John Laugharne was a cousin of Mansell and, with Thomas Harley, Edward and the two Thomas Foleys, a follower of Robert Harley. James Brydges and Thomas Coke also sometimes voted Tory, but were always on the side of the Court. They both voted for Smith. The Court dismissed George Clarke for voting for Bromley, but did not see fit to discipline all seventeen placemen, who voted for him.

248 For example Brett, Copley, Dodson, Duncombe, Mounsteven, and Tredenham do not appear on another voting list for Anne's reign, and Gifford, Hedges, and Trelawny always voted with the Court. This leaves less than twenty members voting for Smith who otherwise voted Tory in Anne's reign.

"The zeal of gentlemen was greater than their knowledge, which brought them up with so much heat, and to be headed by people whose chief excellence was Billingsgate language, which had no other effect than to expose them to the scorn of the rest of mankind. I do not question but with care and application several of the misled gentlemen, who acted not out of malice but ignorance, will be reduced to a better sense and opinion of the queen's government." ²⁴⁹

The test came over the election of the chairman of the committee of elections, a vital position for influencing contested petitions. The Court candidate, Spencer Compton, a Whig, was elected narrowly by 188-172 ²⁵⁰ votes. The Tories were not dejected by this vote. On the contrary Thomas Hearne learned "that, in all probability, the Whiggs will find it a very difficult matter to carry things to their mind, especially if the Church Party keep together in the House, as at present they seem resolv'd ²⁵¹ to do." Harley tried to console Marlborough, and himself, with the comment that "a great many more came too late for the question who would ²⁵² have been for Mr. Compton." Yet neither he nor St. John, nor any of the Tory courtiers, could feel entirely happy with their political situation. Cut adrift from the Tory party they hoped to steer the Court

²⁴⁹ Coxe, ii, 238. Letter dated 26 Oct. 1705.

²⁵⁰ Elizabeth Cunningham, 'The General Election of 1705', unpublished London M.A. thesis (1939), p. 142. The Tories were quite successful in the contested elections. They defeated a motion to hear the Coventry election before the bar of the Commons by 199 to 172 votes and won a vote over the franchise at Amersham by 197 to 168 votes. Commons' Journals, xv, 22, 49.

²⁵¹ Hearne, i, 70.

²⁵² Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. AI-25. To Marlborough, 9 Nov. 1705.

away from the prospect of a safe harbour held out by the Whigs to Marlborough and Godolphin. In fact Harcourt was already showing signs of losing his nerve for the difficult navigation ahead. Godolphin warned Harley: "I have been told this day that our Solicitor-General is wavering again, but I don't know how to believe him so weak to say²⁵³ no more."

253 H. M. C., Portland Mss., iv, 273. Letter dated 10 Nov. 1705.

Chapter Six.

Secretary at War: The Convert to Moderation.

With his appointment as secretary at war in April 1704 Henry St. John had shown himself more interested in office than in remaining true to his high Tory declarations. He never became a Whig, but his ambition had led him to abandon some of his former colleagues, notably William Bromley. Having made the choice he set about making sure that he was not a servile courtier but a vigorous and capable administrator, helping the national interest in the war against France. The secretaryship at war was a junior appointment and did not admit St. John to the inner counsels of the cabinet, but, with the country engaged in a major war, it was a vital post. As the head of an administrative department St. John was responsible for recruitment, billeting, supply, and a whole complex of logistical details. This gave him a finger in many pies and allowed him to see some of the major problems thrown up by the war. In particular it brought home to him the enormous difficulties involved in organising a military expedition to a distant theatre of war. At least he learned that the task of conquering Spain was beyond England's capabilities, though he did not learn enough to prevent him planning the abortive Quebec expedition in 1711. As the first politician holding the post of secretary at war St. John unwittingly inaugurated the era of parliamentary control over the army. It was through its ability to call the secretary at war to account that parliament began to control and guide the armed forces.

In parliament St. John's main duty was to pilot the recruiting bills and the army estimates through the Commons. These were major political issues which affected many members, particularly those who were country gentlemen and J.P.s, and, as the war progressed and became a greater burden, they assumed even greater importance. Thus, in the 1707-1708 session, St. John bore the brunt of the ministry's attempts to explain the shortage of troops in Spain and Portugal and the way the money, that the Commons had voted, had been spent. The secretary at war had no control over pay and ordnance, which were under separate offices, but his duties did bring him into regular contact with the secretaries of state and the commander-in-chief. For St. John this meant close contact and working relations with his two heroes and patrons, Robert Harley and the duke of Marlborough. He also worked directly under Godolphin in such things as the preparation of warrants, and he frequently had direct access to the Queen. While he had to refer many important matters to the secretaries of state for a cabinet decision, he could still exercise considerable initiative, and in many matters his opinions ranked as high as theirs did. He spoke regularly in the Commons on military matters and in many ways he was the cabinet's 'director' of army affairs. Thus St. John's new post gave him an excellent opportunity to prove himself in office and to show the world he was a leading minister in the making.

St. John was shrewd enough to realise that in wartime the vague responsibilities of his office were capable of extension. He was also an astute enough politician to know that work meant power. His first task

was to master his duties and his officials. To Sir William Trumbull he explained:

"that I am very busy is very true, for till I have tumbled over all the books and papers in the office, and am out of the guardianship of my clerks, I cannot be easy. I go in leading strings till I know more of the business than they, and this is what in a month's time I hope to bring about. I am in one respect very inconveniently situated, for my Lord T[reasure]r has not yet fix'd me in any office, so that a little room in my Clerks house in Scotland Yard is the only place I have to receive people that come to me, to write, to read, and, which is abominable to crowd all the books and papers in."¹

In June 1705 he apologised to James Grahme, explaining that his letter "had not been delay'd so long, but that I have been in so great a hurry with country business, elections, ye court, ye office, and ye lawyers, that I have had hardly ye least minute for anything else these six weeks."² St. John was also a man of pleasure, who liked to affect a manner of indifference to fate and fortune, and to suggest that his approach to work was that of the dilettante. It was in this spirit that he wrote to Marlborough in July 1705: "I receiv'd ye honour of yr Grace's letter of the 9th ins. yesterday at this place, where I intend to continue all ye summer; since ye routine of my office, wch is all ye business I have, requires no more dispatch than I can give it by paying my duty once a week to ye Queen att Winsor."³ In fact within three weeks at the most he was

1 Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers. Trumbull Add. Ms. 133, letter 27. Letter dated 2 May 1704.

2 Levens Hall Mss., box D, file S. To Grahme, Whitehall, 23 June 1705.

3 Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. AI-20. Letter dated Bucklebury, 5/16 July 1705.

back at Whitehall and remained there until October when ill health forced him to retire to Bucklebury again to recuperate. Within weeks of him assuming his duties Marlborough was expressing satisfaction with St. John's diligence.⁴ It was an opinion he held throughout their four years of close association.

St. John had long been anxious for office to offset his personal financial dependence upon his father and upon his wife's estates. His secretaryship at war brought him an allowance of one thousand pounds a year, plus pay of one pound a day. He was also granted £455 p.a. for the rent of his office at Whitehall and for the cost of his staff. There was also the perquisite of one day's pay for registering every officer's commission on the muster rolls and one day's pay for every leave of absence granted to a serving officer. St. John always insisted on receiving these perquisites.⁵ There is proof that when he later became secretary of state St John was involved in shady deals concerning army contracts with James Brydges, who made his fortune as paymaster of the

-
- 4 Ibid. AI-14. Marlborough to Godolphin, Vorst, 26 April 1704. R. E. Scouller, The Armies of Queen Anne (Oxford, 1966), though an excellent study of the administration of the army, is marred by an unwarranted attack on St. John's work as secretary at war. On p. 19 Major Scouller gives details of the numerous tasks St. John performed, yet on the previous page he writes: "St. John had scarcely the application necessary for a task such as it [the secretaryship at war] was at that time." See also pp. 3, 19, and 22.
- 5 G. A. Dudley, 'The Early Life of Henry St. John', unpublished University of California Ph.D. thesis (1955), pp. 218-222. A copy of this thesis has been deposited in Berkshire Record Office.

forces abroad.⁶ There is some evidence that St. John interfered with army contracts earlier, while secretary at war, though it is not certain that he was acting dishonestly. For instance, in a letter to Stanhope, James Brydges once wrote:

"Mr. Vincent writes me word that you apprehend ye Stores wch were sent about eight months ago to Spain of Horse accoutrements &c. were sent by Private Persons, & not upon ye Queen's Acc[oun]t. I take therefore ye liberty to assure you of ye contrary, ye Contract having by my Ld Treas[ure]rs order been made by Mr. St. John & myself, & upon a cheaper foot than any of that kind ever was before: but for your Satisfaction in this particular I have enclosed you a Copy of ye Contract with ye Prices fixt upon ye Severall Goods; not but that if you judge those rates too high, you'll please to low'r them to such a degree as may bring them to a fit Price for ye Troops to take them at, it being undoubtedly much better for ye Queen to loose a part of ye cost, than to have ye whole lye undisposed upon Her hands."⁷

Nonetheless, unlike Brydges, Henry St. John never made a fortune though he did procure Marlborough's support in obtaining additional allowances from the lord treasurer. "I am afraid", wrote Marlborough in 1707, "you have

6 See the exchange of correspondence in 'Letters of Henry St. John to James Brydges' and 'Letters from James Brydges, created Duke of Chandos, to Henry St. John, created Viscount Bolingbroke', both ed. Godfrey Davies and Marion Tinling. Huntington Library Bulletin, no. 8 (Oct. 1935) and no. 9 (April 1936).

7 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. The Letter-Books of James Brydges 1702-14. ST. 57, vol. 1, ff. 162-163. To James Stanhope, 12 Feb. 1708/9. I am grateful to G. S. Holmes of Glasgow University and Dr. W. A. Speck of Newcastle University for allowing me to use their microfilms of some of these letter-books. My own microfilm of the rest of the letter-books has been deposited in Newcastle University Library.

forgott to settle with Mr. Bridges the allowance out of the Poundage
which I desired for Mr. St. Johns. I beg the favour of your doing itt." ⁸
Godolphin appeared willing to gratify St. John. ⁹ Even before this letter
of Marlborough's St. John was thanking the general for his kindness: "I
hope yr Grace believes that any accession to me, serves only to increase
a fortune that will always be, as it ought to be, att yr disposal and
that no man living can be more perfectly than myself devoted to yr
interest." ¹⁰ Years later the duchess of Marlborough endorsed one of
St. John's letters to the duke: "The Duke of Marlborough never was so
kind to any man as to him; and I have heard my Lord Godolphin say, that
he never had anything to reproach himself of, in the whole time that he
served the Queen, but in complying with the Duke of Marlborough in doing
unreasonable things, in point of money, for Mr. St. John, at the Duke of
Marlborough's request." ¹¹

More important than his industry or his desire to augment his
pay was St. John's ambitions to extend his duties. His first venture in
this direction led to him signing commissions for officers, the
prerogative of the secretary of state. This obviously led to a rebuff,
though no doubt a mild one, from Harley. St. John was quick to apologise:

8 B. M. Add. Ms. 9100, f. 26. Marlborough to Godolphin, Meldert, 11 July 1707.

9 See Godolphin's letter to Harley, no date but July 1707, which I take to refer to this. B. M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/64/3.

10 B. M. Add. Ms. 9099, f. 62. To Marlborough, Whitehall, 9/20 May 1707.

11 The Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough (London, 1838), II, 292.

"I was a little concerned yesterday at what you told me just as I went away. I would not be guilty of any irregularity even in the most trivial matter of form, and whilst you are Secretary I should not forgive myself if I committed any indecency. I find several notifications of the Queen's pleasure about commissions, signed by me, when it was the Queen that gave the directions herself, and in the books I see the same method was observed before I came in. I look on the bit of paper I sign to be nothing more than a voucher to the officer that goes to desire his commission may be prepared, that he tells truth when he says the Queen or Prince has granted it to him, which makes it not so ridiculous as to deserve laughter.

Should I pretend to signify the Queen's pleasure to a Secretary of State, I should be a coxcomb. However, I will take care to have the form altered for the future. Forgive, dear Master, this trouble and believe you have not in the world a more faithful sincere friend and humble servant than, &c. "12

This early blunder did not prevent St. John and Harley working together harmoniously and even sharing information of a more personal nature. On one occasion St. John wrote to the secretary of state: "Dear Master, having just receiv'd ye inclos'd from general Peterborow according to his desire I transmit it to you for yr information & am yrs everlastingly, Harry. You will please to let me have it again when you have made ye necessary extracts & observations. He promises his next shall be longer, 13 which you shall likewise have the benefit of perusing."

12 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 219. Letter dated Whitehall, 11 Aug. 1705. This was probably only an isolated example of his efforts to widen the scope of his duties, though apparently he did not try to control the judge-advocate-general. Yet "intrusive as he might be on the authority of others, he was jealous of his own, and reprimanded the commanding officer of one unit for writing about the misconduct of officers to the Prince Consort, nominal Generalissimo, instead of to St. John himself." R. E. Scouller, The Armies of Queen Anne, p. 19.

13 B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/156/1. No date.

There was no sign of St. John's appetite for power being satisfied by the secretaryship at war. He was soon seeking to replace George Clarke, secretary to Prince George, the lord high admiral, in addition to retaining his other post. Clarke had voted for Bromley in the contest for the Speakership in 1705 and so he was ripe for dismissal. St. John wrote to Harley requesting that he might take Clarke's place, but asserted that his wish to do so was not to increase his income. In this instance his denial was probably genuine. He was much more interested in the power than the profit that was to be derived from office. His letter was written on 26 October, the day after Clarke had voted for Bromley. To Harley he suggested that he

"might, if he thought proper, succeed to his business, exclusive of what is to be done with the Council of the Lord High Admiral. If my Lord thinks it improper, or more for her Majesty's service to employ another, I am easy. I tell you what I have done and upon what grounds I did it, for you have been so kind in millions of instances to me that I really look on myself as accountable to you for all my actions. The only thing that made me hesitate was, that I should be vexed to be thought greedy after profit, which I despise with all my heart, and serve the Queen on a much better principle. All I can say on this head is, that I will promise to make less of both places than the two gentlemen that had them made of each; and that as I design to make no fortune so I will spend in the Queen's service whatever I get in it. There are some iniquities which do make a noise, that if I do not begin by destroying I will forfeit my character with you for ever willingly."¹⁴

Though we might quibble with St. John's claim that he had no interest in the profit from the post he was soon to justify his confidence that he

¹⁴ H. M. C., Bath Mss., 1, 79. To Harley, Whitehall, 26 Oct. 1705.

could perform the extra duties involved. His petition to Harley was clearly successful and St. John began acting as Prince George's secretary.¹⁵ This meant he was now involved in recruiting men for the navy as well as for the army.¹⁶ He also found himself the chief aide to a principal source of patronage.¹⁷

Marlborough could thank St. John for the improved supply of troops to his army in Flanders. The secretary's registration of all officers on the muster rolls proved useful for indicating their seniority and whereabouts. In particular he subordinated the transport office to his authority and organised embarkations to a fairly routine operation.¹⁸ His chief difficulty, and one which he laboured long to solve, was the raising of recruits. On 10 March 1704 the Commons had agreed, by 104 to 49 votes, to conscription in the counties. The local J.P.s and mayors were to raise "able bodied men as have not any lawfull calling or employment."¹⁹ Once St. John took up his duties he kept up a considerable

15 Bonet noted his appointment in his dispatch to Berlin, 6/17 Nov. 1705. Prussian Mss. 30 A, f. 365.

16 Huntington Library, California. The Letter-Book of Thomas Fane, 6th earl of Westmorland, 1705-8. HM 774, f. 9. St. John to the earl of Westmorland, 21 Jan. 1705/6. A microfilm of this letter-book has been deposited in Newcastle University Library by Dr. W. A. Speck.

17 Ibid., ff. 18-19. Westmorland to St. John, 22 and 23 March 1706, seeking warrants to promote men to be register and marshal of Dover Castle.

18 G. A. Dudley, 'The Early Life of Henry St. John', unpublished University of California Ph.D. thesis (1955), pp. 277-8.

19 Commons' Journals, xiv, 374.

correspondence with both civil and military personnel, dealing with individual problems. He forwarded the justices' reports to the clerk of the council or to the secretaries of state, to be laid before the council, and completed the whole operation by making arrangements with the transport commissioners, the admiralty, and the regiments themselves, for transportation to Marlborough's army. Each year the routine was the same and St. John, on the whole, supplied Marlborough's needs, and before the campaign season opened. The system began breaking down only when England had to contribute large forces to the new theatres of war in Spain and Portugal. This culminated in the great shortage of troops at the battle of Almanza in April 1707. The shortage was due principally to the failure to recruit satisfactorily for this service. Yet the failure was not an administrative blunder by St. John, but resulted from the general shortage of manpower. The army now required 12,000 recruits each year. Clearly the government had undertaken commitments which needed a supply of 20 recruits which even the most efficient secretary at war could not procure. Godolphin himself admitted: "We have too many irons in the fire. We can't be in the Mediterranean, in Portugal, upon the coast of France, and in the West Indies all at once."²¹

St. John's position as secretary at war gave him the opportunity to make a reputation in office to match his fame as a backbench orator.

20 L. F. Burton, 'The Supply of Infantry for the Peninsula 1703-1707'.
Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. (1955), xxviii, 35-58.

21 H. M. C., Portland Mss., iv, 59. To Robert Harley, 28 Mar. 1703.

He was fortunate in holding the post when the country was engaged in a major war. Even more fortunate was he to serve the great duke of Marlborough, for he could bask in some of the reflected glory of Blenheim and Ramillies. To his credit St. John recognised his debt to the general's brilliant gifts, and he frequently paid tribute to Marlborough. He wrote effusive letters of congratulations to the commander while he was secretary at war, but he did not spare his praises even when he was neither in office nor in parliament.²² To his friends he acknowledged his debt to Marlborough. After Ramillies he wrote to Sir William Trumbull: "Ye Duke of Marlborough has crown'd all his glorious actions. I do indeed take a particular part in all his fortune, I have been so happy as to share his good fortune, & I would with pleasure have shar'd his bad. I never can forget those to whom I owe so much as I do to him & to you."²³ In 1709, when he was convinced peace was necessary, he could still confess to James Brydges of "a faith, wch comes neare toe Superstition, in my Id Duke."²⁴ Though he was a leading member of the ministry which dismissed Marlborough and even charged him with corruption, he never lost his admiration for the great commander. Years later he wrote: "I take with

-
- 22 See his letters of congratulation to Marlborough, after Oudenarde and Malplaquet, dated London, 6/17 July 1708, and Bucklebury, 8 Sept. 1709. B.M. Add. Ms. 9102, f. 34 and Blenheim Palace, Marlborough papers, BI-28.
- 23 Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers. Trumbull Add. Ms. 133, letter 35. Letter dated Whitehall, 7 June 1706.
- 24 'Letters of Henry St. John to James Brydges', ed. Godfrey Davies and Marion Tinling. Huntington Library Bulletin (Oct. 1935), no. 8, p. 161. Letter dated Bucklebury, 26 June 1709.

pleasure this opportunity of doing justice to that great man, whose faults I knew, whose virtues I admired; and whose memory, as the greatest general, and as the greatest minister, that our country or perhaps any other has produced, I honour."²⁵

In addition to his friendly relations with Marlborough, St. John was soon on amicable terms with the general's friends. He took a close interest in Cadogan's election in 1705 and he was on familiar terms with Cardonnel, the commander's secretary. With James Brydges he established a friendship which continued after his own fall in 1708 and in lieutenant-general Thomas Erle he discovered a fellow rake: "I got to Town last night early, writ my Letters, lay with my Mistress, and after nine hours continued sleep, find myself in perfect health, so that I discover with great joy in your humble servant a Constitution fit for one that is Secretary to so many Rakes."²⁶ Much more important, for his future career, were the impressions he gained of the allies and of the progress of the war. When he later became secretary of state and took a leading part in the peace negotiations he was accused of betraying England's allies. His poor opinion of these allies was not assumed simply as an excuse for leaving them in the lurch by making a separate peace. His impressions had been gained during his years as secretary at war, when he frequently accused them of hindering Marlborough and obstructing the successful prosecution of

25 Bolingbroke's Defence of the Treaty of Utrecht, ed. G. M. Trevelyan, p. 91.

26 Charborough Park. Erle papers. St. John to Erle, Whitehall, 31 July 1706.

the war. He was furious with the Dutch when, in 1705, they refused to assist Marlborough to continue his offensive operations.

"Yours", he wrote to Thomas Erle, "found me rejoicing with my friends att ye great & almost incredible Success wch my Lord Duke had in ye affair of the Lines, and I write this while I am cens[u]ring ye Stupidity, pique & cowardice of ye Dutch officers & Deputys who labour all they can to make ye advantage we have gain'd of no consequence In short Sir one would run mad if one was to think of ye combination of villany & stupidity we have to struggle with. I hope Ld Marlborough will be able to cheat 'em into an engagement & when they are att the ball they must dance."²⁷

Two weeks later he commented: "Ye fears of Dopt, ye malice of Slangenberg & ye ignorance of ye Deputys have hitherto prevail'd to blast every design²⁸ and to render ye war an impertinent jest." If anything St. John was even more hostile towards his Austrian allies. On one occasion he wrote to his kinsman, Lord Cutts:

"My Lord Marlborough was, by the last letters, at the Hague, from whence he intended to go to the army to give his last orders and so proceed to Vienna. Pray God they may be able to do any good at that Court! It is insufferable that England and Holland must every day take a greater burden upon them, while the House of Austria - entirely applied to secure the confiscations of Hungary and procure more - seems rather neuter than a party in the war against France."²⁹

As late as 1707 he was still cursing the conduct of affairs in Germany where "our friends are att their usual rate, backward, unprepar'd,³⁰ helpless."

27 Ibid. St. John to Erle, Whitehall, 24 July 1705.

28 Ibid. St. John to Erle, Whitehall, 7 Aug. 1705.

29 H. M. C., Frankland-Russell-Astley Mss., p. 187. Letter dated Bucklebury, 9 Oct. 1705.

30 Charborough Park. Erle papers. St. John to Erle, Whitehall, 25 Feb. 1706/7.

Whatever personal advantages he acquired from his post as secretary at war St. John retained enough of the attributes of a Tory country gentleman to want a good peace as rapidly as possible. There is little evidence that he agreed with the Whigs' insistence upon 'no peace without Spain', though he did hope that Spain and the West Indies might be wrested from French influence. In 1706 he was disappointed at the failure of the Archduke Charles, the Austrian claimant, to retain his hold on the throne of Spain. "By our accounts from Spain," he informed Thomas Erle, "King Charles seems to have pay'd dear for not striking whilst ye iron was hot. Great contention arises here where the blame of all this fatal ill success should be lay'd. For my part I am indifferent as to that matter, in comparison of the concern I have to see this lost game retreiv'd." ³¹ Before the next campaigning season opened he had regained his confidence in the allied effort in Spain: "I look upon this year as that which is in effect to end ye war and provided you can in Spain make a good game we have no great concern upon us." ³² By the end of that year's campaigns he had lost confidence in the allies' ability to win Spain from Philip V, and he commented sadly: "Against ye ³³ next year we must take new measures and in a manner begin ye War anew."

31 Ibid. Letter dated Whitehall, 22 Aug. 1706. St. John was a member of the committee, which, on 3 November 1705, drew up an address supporting the demand to give Spain to the Austrian claimant. See, infra, p.323.

32 Ibid. To Thomas Erle, Whitehall, 20 Jan. 1706/7.

33 Ibid. To Thomas Erle, Winsor Castle, 31 Aug. 1707.

Before the next campaign however he had seen fit to resign his post as secretary at war.

St. John had become disillusioned both with the allies and with the prospect of winning Spain for the Austrian claimant, but his resignation was caused by his untenable political position. As we have seen the election of the Speaker in 1705 had left St. John out on a limb with a group of less than thirty Tories who were willing to support the ministry. The other Tories, the vast majority, were united behind Bromley in the Commons and behind Nottingham and Rochester in the Lords. St. John had assured Thomas Coke that the Queen desired to be above and free of party faction and that he had not misrepresented her view can be seen from the Queen's letter to Godolphin as early as July 1705: "I dread the falling into the hands of either party, and the Whigs have had so many favours showed them of late that I fear a very few more will put me into their power, which is what I'm sure you would not have happen no more than I." ³⁴ Robert Harley, whom St. John now regarded as his political mentor, was also careful to warn Godolphin that he hoped that the Court would not alienate the Tories further by too great a dependence upon the Whigs:

"The foundation is, persons or parties are to come in to the Queen, and not the Queen to them; ... The embodying of gentlemen (country gentlemen I mean) against the Queen's service is what is to be avoided ... If persons who serve without reproach be turned out for not being of a party it will increase the jealousy that a

34 B.M. Add. Ms. 28070, f. 12. Queen Anne to Godolphin, 11 July 1705.

party who have once been narrow-spirited will be so again If the gentlemen of England are made sensible that the Queen is the Head and not a party everything will be easy, and the Queen will be courted and not a party; but if otherwise ——."35

The appointment of the Whig, William Cowper, as lord keeper on 11 October 1705 could hardly have pleased Harley, St. John, and the remaining Tory courtiers. Even worse was Godolphin's calculation that it was more important to hold on to Whig support than to conciliate the Tories.³⁶ This opinion was born of an awareness of Whig support for the war and of weariness at several years of obstructive tactics by the high Tories. It was further confirmed in the next two sessions as the Tories did their best to embarrass and hinder the work of the ministry without putting forward any genuine alternative policy.

As soon as the parliamentary session of 1705-6 was underway the Tory opposition launched concurrently two attacks on the ministry, asserting that both the Church and the protestant succession were in danger. On 15 November Lord Haversham, a fairly recent Tory convert, opened a debate in the Lords on the state of the nation. After a few preliminary skirmishes against the war effort of the allies he moved that the heir presumptive, Princess Sophia, should be invited to England to secure the

35 H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 74-75. Harley to Godolphin, 4 Sept. 1705.

36 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 291. Godolphin to Harley, Good Friday night. [22 Mar. 1705/6].

protestant succession. The motion was defeated by a large majority, but eleven Tory peers signed a protest.³⁷ Neither the Court nor the Whig peers could afford to appear less committed to the Hanoverian cause than the Tories and so a motion was passed to consider means of further securing the protestant succession.³⁸ In the meantime the Court reacted vigorously and, probably at Lord Somers's instigation,³⁹ decided to overreach the Tories by proposing a Regency Act. The Queen was resolutely opposed to seeing her successor in England during her lifetime and this bill aimed to set up machinery whereby regents would govern the country in the interval between the Queen's death and the arrival of the protestant successor. The plan was laid before the Lords on 19 November 1705 and next day the eight officials who were to act as regents were listed.⁴⁰ On the 29th Lord Rochester "with a warmth more than common" wanted the Act of Uniformity entrenched against any changes by the regents.⁴¹ The Tories attempted further amendments on 3 December when they tried to limit

37 Lords' Debates, ii, 148-151, and Lords' Journals, xviii, 19. The Tory peers who signed the protest were Abingdon, Anglesea, Buckingham, Conway, Haversham, Howard, Jersey, Leigh, Nottingham, Rochester, and Winchelsea.

38 Ibid., xviii, 19.

39 Burnet, v, 235 n. Onslow's note. G. M. Trevelyan, The Reign of Queen Anne, ii, 92, thought the suggestion might have come from Wharton. Later both Somers and Cowper wrote to the Elector of Hanover to explain their reasons for adopting the expedient of the Regency act. B.M. Stowe Mss. 222, ff. 386-387 and 241, f. 53. Letters dated 11 and 12 April 1706.

40 Lords' Journals, xviii, 20-22. The eight regents or lords justices were to be the archbishop of Canterbury, the lord high admiral, the lord treasurer, the lord keeper or chancellor, the lord president of the council, the lord privy seal, the lord steward, and lord chief justice. The heir presumptive could add any others he saw fit.

41 Carlisle Public Library. Bishop Nicolson's diaries, no. 6, 29 Nov. 1705.

the powers of the regents, by preventing them from tampering with important laws like the Habeas Corpus Act, the Toleration Act, the laws governing the succession, the Triennial Act, or the laws relating to treason. The bill passed despite protests from the Tories that the regents were given too much power.⁴²

In the Commons, on 4 December, Sir Thomas Hanmer moved to invite over Princess Sophia, and he was supported by Bromley, Benson, and nearly all the Tories except Pakington and one or two others. The opposition to the motion came from the Whigs, led by Robert Walpole and Henry Boyle, and from the Court Tories, including St. John, Harley and Harcourt. A head-on clash was averted by a procedural device when the Court successfully moved that the chairman should leave the chair. At first the Whigs wanted to continue the debate, but, when Harley pointed out that they would have an opportunity to do so later, they voted with the Court.⁴³ This breathing space allowed the Court to bring in the Regency bill. On 11 December the bill was granted a first reading by 133 to 68 votes, with two Tories, Sir Roger Mostyn and Hugh [or Sir George?] Parker, acting as tellers for the minority.⁴⁴ Eight days later a second reading was granted

⁴² Lords' Journals, xviii, 40-41, and Lords' Debates, ii, 153-4. The various protests were signed by eighteen peers, all Tories, namely, Anglesea, Beaufort, Buckingham, Caernarvon, Denbigh, Granville, Guernsey, Guilford, Haversham, North and Grey, Northampton, Nottingham, Rochester, Scarsdale, Thanet, Weymouth, the bishop of London, and the bishop of Bath and Wells.

⁴³ Boyer's Annals, iv, 202, and B.M.Add.Ms. 9094, ff. 221-222. James Brydges to Marlborough, 4 Dec. 1705.

⁴⁴ Commons' Journals, xv, 61.

by 182 to 165 votes, with Charles Caesar and Ralph Freeman acting as tellers for the substantial Tory minority.⁴⁵ During the short debate the bill was attacked by Sir William Whitlock and Sir John Pakington.⁴⁶ Charles Caesar undoubtedly went too far when he declared: "There is a noble Lord, without whose Advice the Queen does nothing, who, in the late Reign was known to keep a constant Correspondence with the Court at St. Germaines." This was taken to be a provocative tilt at Godolphin, and Caesar's attempts to withdraw his remarks did not prevent him being committed to the Tower.⁴⁷ During the committee stage of the bill, on 12 January 1706, there was a heated debate. John Ward, a leading Tory 'whip', criticised the exorbitant powers of the regents. Sir Humphrey Mackworth, another Tory, claimed that some men would be pleased at the absence of the successor so that France could put a prince upon the throne. Sir Thomas Hanmer, rapidly emerging as one of the most respected Tory leaders, admitted that the bill would have the advantage of preventing a vacuum of authority on the death of the Queen, but thought the arrival of Princess Sophia would solve the problem more safely.⁴⁸ The Tory courtiers, on the other hand, supported the bill. Foley thought the

⁴⁵ Ibid., xv, 70.

⁴⁶ Prussian Mss. 31 B, ff. 8 v - 9. Bonet's dispatch to Berlin, dated London, 21 Dec. 1705. Pakington had probably opposed Hanmer's motion of 4 December out of respect to the Queen's known objections to the arrival of the princess during her lifetime.

⁴⁷ Commons' Journals, xv, 70.

⁴⁸ Cambridge University Library. Add. Ms. 7093, ff. 10, 103, and 115.

bill unfortunate, but necessary. St. John declared that it was but "human prudence to secure ye succession." Robert Harley helped to lay aside the clause making the privy council the responsible executive advisers to the successor to the throne. He also obtained a provision to allow the Queen's last elected parliament to sit for six months after her death, even if it had been dissolved, for "no regency will have heart or courage without Parliament sitting."⁴⁹

The most important debate revolved around the thorny question of placemen. The Tories could always rally considerable support, even from the Whigs, for a policy of excluding placemen from the Commons. Playing on the fears that the place clause in the Act of Settlement would be suspended by the Regency bill, Ralph Freeman led the high Tories in a bid to obstruct and perhaps even defeat the whole bill. He moved to secure the general exclusion of all placemen as under the terms of the Act of Settlement. The move was opposed by Arthur Moore, one of St. John's closest associates, and by Whigs like Lord Coningsby and Sir Richard Onslow,⁵⁰ but it was only narrowly defeated by 156 to 151 votes on 12 January 1706.⁵¹ Despite this set-back the Tories allied with the Country Whigs in bringing forward a more limited place clause. This clause would exclude all placemen from the Commons in the next reign except

⁴⁹ Ibid., ff. 36, 83, and 92-93.

⁵⁰ Ibid., ff. 72-75.

⁵¹ Commons' Journals, xv, 85. The tellers for the minority were Ralph Freeman and Sir Christopher Hales.

some forty seven important officials who could remain in the House if re-elected. Henry St. John, Robert Harley, and Robert Walpole were among the Court-Whig opposition to this amendment.⁵² Instead the ministry put forward counter proposals whereby certain placemen would be incapacitated after the dissolution of the present parliament, but they could seek re-election. The Lords upset this project when they voted by the large majority of 68 to 25, to accept the proposal of Wharton and Somers to repeal the whole place clause in the Act of Settlement.⁵³ The Commons refused, by 205 to 183 votes, to accept the Lords' amendment.⁵⁴ This was a notable Tory success for the tellers for the majority were Sir Roger Mostyn and Sir William Pole, two tackers. Nevertheless, after an intense struggle, the Court managed to defeat the opposition clause and substitute its own clause whereby various minor officials and pensioners were excluded from the Commons, though all other placemen could seek re-election. This was passed on the 15 February by 220 to 197 votes, and, three days later, the Commons agreed to accept this amendment to the bill,⁵⁵ while defeating an amendment to have the place clause become operative after the dissolution.⁵⁶

52 Cambridge University Library. Add. Ms. 7093, ff. 78, and 82-3.

53 Carlisle Public Library. Bishop Nicolson's diaries, no. 7, 31 Jan. 1706.

54 Commons' Journals, xv, 127. 4 Feb. 1706.

55 Ibid., xv, 153, 159-160. The tellers for the minority on the 15th were Arthur Annesley and Sir Thomas Hanmer. For an excellent study of the various place bills during this period see G. S. Holmes, 'The Attack on 'the influence of the Crown' 1702-16'. Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. (1966), xxxix, 47-68.

56 Commons' Journals, xv, 159. The vote was 205 to 186 with Robert Benson and John Toke, both Tories, acting as tellers for the minority.

This controversy over the placemen was very much of a Court - Country issue, rather than an illustration of the Whig-Tory dichotomy. However, it is useful in that a voting list has survived,⁵⁷ which purports to show the Court supporters on this division. Walcott suggested that the list referred to the division of 18 February on the proposal to bring the new provisions of the Regency bill into effect at the end of the session, a proposal which had been defeated by 205 to 186 votes. This can only remain an inspired guess since, although it fits the figure of the Court supporters, it includes the two tellers, Sir John Holland and James Brydges. Nor is it an entirely reliable list for it includes Thomas Dore, who died in December 1705. Nonetheless, it gives a good indication of the support upon which the Court could rely at this critical juncture. It shows the extent to which the ministry was dependent upon Whig support and the inability of the Harley-St. John Tories to persuade more of their former friends to support the Court. Of the 205 Court supporters on this list no fewer than 169 of them consistently voted Whig during the reign, eight do not appear on any of the other extant voting lists, and only 28 ever recorded a vote on the Tory lists of the period. Five of these twenty-eight members cannot really be classed as Tories for they voted Whig several times, but only voted Tory once

57 R. R. Walcott, 'Division Lists of the House of Commons, 1689-1715', Bull.Inst.Hist.Res. (1936-37), xiv, 30-33, and Boyer's Annals, vii, app., 150-153.

each.⁵⁸ They were usually found on the Court side as were at least
three others who were recorded as having cast a Tory vote.⁵⁹ Thus only
twenty of the 205 members on this list normally voted Tory. This was the
sum total of the Harleyite Tories at this juncture. Of these twenty
members, thirteen held places under the Crown,⁶⁰ three others were personal
adherents of Robert Harley,⁶¹ and only four Tories voted for the Court on
this issue for no very clear motive.⁶² They may have been more influenced

-
- 58 John Borlase voted Whig in 1705 and 1708, but for Dr. Sacheverell in 1710. Sir Roger Bradshaigh voted Whig in 1705 and 1710, but Tory in 1713. Charles Godfrey voted Whig in 1703, 1705, 1708, 1710, and 1711, but Tory in 1713. Craven Peyton voted Whig in 1705, 1708, and 1710, but Tory in 1713. Russell Robartes voted Whig in 1703, 1705, 1708, and 1710, but Tory in 1713. In 1706 Bradshaigh was an army colonel, Godfrey was master of the jewel office, Peyton was master of the mint, and Robartes was groom of the bedchamber to Prince George. Similar reasons might have persuaded them to vote Tory (Court) in 1713.
- 59 James Brydges, paymaster-general of the forces abroad; Sir William Gifford, commissioner of the navy, resident at Portsmouth; and William Lowndes, secretary to the treasury.
- 60 Sir John Bland, commissioner of customs; Sir Gilbert Dolben, justice of common pleas in Ireland; William Ettrick, council of the admiralty; George Granville, governor of Pendennis; Sir Simon Harcourt, solicitor-general; Edward Harley, auditor of the imprests; Robert Harley, secretary of state; Arthur Moore, comptroller of army accounts; Edward Nicholas, treasurer to Prince George; Henry Paget, council of the admiralty; Sir Thomas Powys, Queen's sergeant; Henry St. John, secretary at war; and Edward Southwell, secretary of state in Ireland.
- 61 Thomas Foley and Thomas Harley, both cousins of Robert Harley, and Robert Monckton, Harley's go-between with the duke of Newcastle. The last was more of a Whig than a Tory, though he voted Tory in 1713.
- 62 Nicholas Hooper, William Pierrepont, John Webb, and Gilbert Yarde. It might be argued that another seven members on this list should be counted as Tories, but none of these appears on any of the Tory lists for the reign. They were Henry Brett, Charles and George Churchill, Sir Charles Hedges, James Kendall, Sir Joseph Tredenham, and Charles Trelawny. They had shown signs of being Tories in William III's reign, but they only voted with the Court in Anne's reign, in 1705 and 1706.

by constitutional than political considerations on this particular issue. Seven of the twenty had not voted for Smith in the contest for the Speakership in 1705. Sir Thomas Powys had not voted in 1705, and of the six who had voted for Bromley four of them were those four Tories who were not attached to the Court, that is Hooper, Pierrepont, Webb, and Yarde. They probably did not go on supporting the Court after this vote. Thus the number of Tory supporters of the Court had increased by precisely two, Bland and Dolben, and both of these were placemen anyway. The desire of Harley and St. John to bolster the ministry with greater Tory support was not fulfilled in this division. Even on a Court-Country issue the vast majority of the Tories had voted together, and in opposition to the Court.

The other controversy on which the Tories united to harass the ministry was on the old question of 'the Church in danger'. On 6 December 1705 Lord Rochester opened a debate on this question in the Lords. He claimed that there were three justifications for his fear for the Church's safety; the Security Act passed in Scotland, the heir presumptive not being brought over to England, and the failure to pass the Occasional Conformity bill. No one seconded him for a quarter of an hour, then Lord Halifax rose to criticise the speech. This was probably a false move for it incited further speeches on both sides. The religious issues were discussed by the archbishop of York, who deplored the increase in Dissenting Academies, and by the bishop of London, who spoke of the intolerable licentiousness of the press. The old duke of Leeds assured the House that the Queen herself supported the need for an Occasional Conformity bill. The motion was

defeated by 61 to 30 votes, with nearly all the Tory minority registering
a protest.⁶³ Between the 8th and the 14th the Commons debated whether to
concur in an address by the Lords that the Church was not in danger. The
Tories again took the lead in claiming that the Church was in danger.
Charles Caesar assured the House that the failure of the last Occasional
Conformity bill was a sure sign of the Church being in danger. William
Bromley spoke of the libellous pamphlets by both Dissenters and Papists,
which the ministry had done nothing to suppress. The dangerous increase
in the number of Dissenting Academies was the main topic of Sir John
Pakington's speech. Robert Harley tried to answer all the critics by
asserting that it was an "abominable practise to insinuate ye danger."⁶⁴
On 8 December the Tories failed to have the sentence left out of the address,
which described those who suggested the Church was in danger as enemies to
the Queen, the Church, and the Kingdom.⁶⁵ On the 14th the Commons agreed
to the Lords' address and Henry St. John, who must have supported the motion,

63 Lords' Debates, ii, 154-161. The 28 dissenting peers were Abington, Anglesey, Beaufort, Buckingham, Caernarvon, Chandos, Conway, Craven, Denbigh, Granville, Guernsey, Guilford, Haversham, Howard of Escrick, Leeds, Northampton, North and Gray, Nottingham, Osborn, Rochester, Scarsdale, Thanet, Weymouth, Winchelsea, the archbishop of York, and the bishops of London, Rochester, and Bath and Wells. The other two Tory voters were Leigh and Sussex. Boyer's Annals, iv, 212.

64 Cambridge University Library. Add. Ms. 7093, ff. 18-21.

65 Commons' Journals, xv, 58. The vote was 212 to 162, with Arthur Annesley and Sir Thomas Hanmer as tellers for the substantial Tory majority.

was sent to desire a conference with the peers on the address.⁶⁶ Finally the Queen received the address that under her happy reign the Church was in "a most safe and flourishing condition."⁶⁷

While the Tories were engaged in sharp attacks on the ministry the Whigs were showing the ministers what dependable allies they could be. Not only did they save the Court from these Tory attacks, but they displayed considerable zeal for the war. The supplies were voted with commendable speed.⁶⁸ On 3 November 1705 a committee, which included Henry St. John, had drawn up an address in support of the war, with the important sentence: "We are fully convinc'd, that the Balance of Power in Europe can never be restor'd till the Monarchy of Spain is in the possession of the House of Austria."⁶⁹ When, on 27 November, the Queen addressed both Houses she incorporated this sentence in her speech. England now appeared committed to wider war aims than had been laid down in the Grand Alliance, which said nothing of securing Spain for the Austrian claimant. The Tories were not pleased with this development and in the Lords they criticised the whole handling of the war. On 22 November Nottingham proposed an address to the Queen to discover the reasons for the late disappointments on the Moselle. The debate lasted for four hours and the exchanges were mainly between Godolphin and Nottingham, but the latter's motion was heavily defeated by 53 to 20 votes. When, later the same day, Rochester tried to reopen the

66 Ibid., xv, 65.

67 Commons' Debates, iiii, 449.

68 Ibid., iiii, 446.

69 Commons' Journals, xv, 13.

debate, Halifax and Wharton declared it was unparliamentary and they
70
successfully moved for an adjournment. Instead the House voted an
address in favour of good correspondence with the allies and a vigorous
71
prosecution of the war.

For the first time in the reign the ministry went through a
parliamentary session unscathed, largely due to the support given by the
Whigs. After the session closed the Whigs began pressing Godolphin for
some recognition of their services. They urged that the earl of
Sunderland, a leading member of the Junto, should become secretary of
state. Sunderland was personally obnoxious to the Queen, but some
72
concessions to the Whigs were made. Neither Harley nor St. John could
view these developments without misgivings. Sir John Bland, an adherent
of Harley's, had been persuaded to leave the high Tories to support the
Court, and his reward was dismissal. If such was to be the future
direction of the Court then the position of Harley, St. John, and their
small band of followers, would become intolerable. St. John voiced his
fears of an enforced retirement to his friend Colonel James Grahme. In
July 1706 he admitted: "A peace may be made and more leisure fall to my

70 Carlisle Public Library. Bishop Nicolson's diaries, no. 6, 22 Nov. 1705.

71 Lords' Journals, xviii, 24.

72 In May 1706 the Whig duke of Rutland replaced the Tory earl of Denbigh as lord lieutenant of Leicestershire, and Lord Wharton replaced the Tory earl of Thanet in Westmorland. Sir John Bland was replaced as one of the revenue commissioners of Ireland by the Whig, Sir William St. Quintin. Hearne, 1, 245. 16 May 1706.

share, or I may happen to fall on ye Slippery ground of a Court, and roll down to this quiet place [Bucklebury], in either case my horses and my dogs will help me pass most of ye time which I can spare from ye offices of friendship." ⁷³

Shortly after this letter he was writing again: "We stand on slippery ground and thank God I will fall soft whenever it comes

to my lot to tumble. I keep you before my eyes, you have been a

courtier & are a northern country gentleman." ⁷⁴ George Granville, another

Tory at present attached to the ministry, wrote to Grahme in language that was more colourful, but as much to the point: "If we are wise this session,

we may again recover ground, but that is not done by opposition. Ladies are to be courted, & not ravished. If our country Gentlemen would be more

courtly in their addresses, I am certain we stand fairest in affection.

But then we must resolve to lay aside our rough play." ⁷⁵ Granville could

see, like St. John, that the Tories were losing ground at Court to the

Whigs, but he appeared more hopeful about retrieving the situation.

It was certainly true that the Tory courtiers could still count upon the Queen's support in resisting further concessions to the Whigs. At the end of August she was still writing to Godolphin, opposing Sunderland's promotion though anxious to avoid throwing herself into the hands of the

73 Levens Hall Mss. Box D, file S. Letter dated Bucklebury, 16 July 1706.

74 Ibid. Letter dated Whitehall, 3 Aug. 1706.

75 Ibid. File G. Letter dated 21 Sept. 1706.

violent Tories.⁷⁶ Harley, like the Queen, opposed Sunderland's promotion. On 25 September he wrote: "Can you stop the whigs that they will not possess themselves (as a faction) of your authority if you stand not here?"⁷⁷ He also pointed out that the Whigs were numerically inferior to the Tories.⁷⁸ St. John agreed entirely with Harley and he approved of the proposal that they should begin safeguarding their position by resuming contact with Tory leaders like Bromley and Hanmer. In a very important letter of 5 November 1706 he made it clear that their position might become untenable and he suggested a possible solution should events get out of control:

"Nothing, dear Master, will continue long within its due bounds, but a short-lived inundation may prove a lasting evil. The torrent may make such a havoc and leave such scars in a little time as years will not repair. If you will give me leave to bring the allegory still more close, no husbandman in his right senses ever let that flood violently in to spoil his grounds and destroy his fruits which with care he might have guided in gentle streams to the improvement of both.

I am glad you find the same disposition where you have been as I believe is in other places. It will be one of the greatest pleasures I can have to be instrumental under you in making a proper use of it; in order to this, sure we must have a little more commerce with some gentlemen than has been of late kept up.

-
- 76 Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne, ed. Beatrice Curtis Brown, p. 196. Letter dated Windsor, 30 Aug. 1706. See also her letter of 21 Sept. 1706, ibid., pp. 199-201.
- 77 B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/9/38. Notes, either for the Queen or Godolphin, dated 25 Sept. 1706.
- 78 H.M.C., Bath Mss., 1, 107 and 110-111. Godolphin to Harley, 10 Oct. and Harley to Godolphin, 15 Oct. 1706.

I did not believe when I writ last to you that the application made by Mr. B[romley] and Sir T[homas] H[anmer] was the effect of your advice, but I do imagine in fact there has been some negotiation of that sort."⁷⁹

The negotiations with these high Tory leaders were rather hesitant and desultory, but were to be opened seriously in later years when the situation of the Harley-St. John Tories had indeed become impossible.

The efforts of Harley and St. John to stem the Whig tide proved abortive. In September the Whig Junto delivered an ultimatum to the Court, via the duchess of Marlborough.⁸⁰ The duke himself made the situation clear to the Queen: "Madam, the truth is that the heads of one party [the Tories] have declared against you and your government Now should your Majesty disoblige the others, how is it possible to obtain five millions for carrying on the war with vigour, without which all is undone?"⁸¹ The Queen capitulated and in December Sunderland replaced

Hedges as secretary of state. Harley and St. John did not abandon the struggle or the Court scene. The former in particular still hoped to influence the Queen. He was also very interested in the main topic of the new parliamentary session - the Union with Scotland.⁸²

In the parliamentary session of 1706-7 all the supply bills for

79 Ibid., i, 121. St. John to Harley, Whitehall, 5 Nov. 1706.
80 Coxe, iii, 94. Sunderland to Lady Marlborough, London, 17/28 Sept. 1706.

81 Ibid., iii, 118. Letter dated Cambron, 24 Oct. 1706.

82 See his numerous letters to Daniel Defoe, whom he sent to Scotland to promote the union. H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, passim, and Letters of Defoe, ed. G. H. Healey, passim.

the war were rushed through parliament and Marlborough was granted the £5000 p.a. from the post office, which had been refused in 1702.⁸³ The main subject of debate during the session was the passing of the Act of Union. The Whigs and the Court were determined to secure the treaty, both to improve relations with Scotland and to safeguard the protestant succession. The high Tories made what resistance they could mainly on the issue of defending the Church of England. On 3 February 1707 Nottingham stated that the Scottish parliament had seen fit to guarantee the Presbyterian Church in Scotland and he wished to support a clause to secure the Church of England. The amendment was rejected, but the Tory peers signed a protest.⁸⁴ A separate act to secure the Church of England was vouchsafed the Tories and the archbishop of Canterbury was ordered to prepare it.⁸⁵ During the debates on several clauses of the Act of Union

83 G. M. Trevelyan, England under Queen Anne, ii, 172.

84 Lords' Journals, xviii, 225. The dissenting peers were Anglesey, Ashburnham, Beaufort, Buckingham, Craven, Granville, Guernsey, Guilford, Howard of Escrick, North and Grey, Northampton, Nottingham, Rochester, Scarsdale, Stawell, Sussex, Thanet, Weymouth, the archbishop of York, and the bishops of London, Chester, Durham, and Rochester. Lords' Debates, ii, 167-8, gives the same names, except for Ashburnham, Rochester, and the bishop of London. This source is surprisingly inaccurate, especially as to dates, on the debates on the Act of Union.

85 The archbishop of York, a Tory, opposed this bill as not continuing the Test Act as well as the Act of Uniformity. Thomas Sharp, The Life of John Sharp, Lord Archbishop of York, ed. Thomas Newcome (London, 1825), i, 390.

the Tory peers continually brought forward the question of safeguarding the Church of England. In the debate on 4 February Lord Haversham declared that he could not forget the differences between the two countries in forms of worship.⁸⁶ In the debate on the representation of Scottish peers in the Lords after the Union several peers, including Nottingham and Lord North and Grey, claimed that since "those Scots peers would be such as were addicted to the Kirk, it might prove of a dangerous Consequence to the Church of England." The bishop of Bath and Wells "was humbly of Opinion, that some Provisions might be made for debarring them of their Vote in any Church Matter that should hereafter come in Agitation."⁸⁷ The Tories tried to insert a clause making the Test Act perpetual and inalienable. This was defeated, and the same twenty three Tory peers signed a protest.⁸⁸ On 27 February the Lords read the various clauses of the Treaty of Union and only Tory peers objected to one or other of the clauses.⁸⁹ On 4 March when the Act of Union received its third reading Lord North and Grey offered a rider that ratification of the bill did not imply approbation of the Presbyterian method of worship. This was defeated by the large majority of

86 Lords' Debates, ii, 169. The date of the debate was 4 February not 15 January as here.

87 Ibid., ii, 175. The debate was not on 24 January as here but either on 13 or 15 Feb. 1707.

88 Prussian Mss. 32 C, f. 54. Bonet's dispatch to Berlin, dated London, 14/25 Feb. 1707.

89 The articles can be seen in Lords' Journals, xviii, 253-261. A few Tories protested at several individual clauses. The dissenting peers were Abington, Beaufort, Buckingham, Granville, Guilford, Haversham, Howard of Escrick, Leigh, North and Grey, Rochester, Stawell, and the bishop of Bath and Wells. Ibid., xviii, 260-261.

55 to 17 votes, but again the staunch Tory peers signed a protest.⁹⁰

When the bill passed the same day fourteen of the same group of Tory peers
⁹¹
signed a last ditch protest.

In the Commons it was again the high Tory element that led the opposition to the Act of Union. On 4 February 1707 Sir John Pakington
⁹²
spoke on the serious differences between the two national churches. Six days later there was an attempt made to add a clause which would name the Test Acts in the act to secure the Church of England. The motion was defeated by 211 to 163 votes, with the tellers for the minority being the
⁹³
Tories, James Bulkeley and Sir William Pole. On the 22nd the Tories failed by 184 to 118 votes to pass an amendment that the subjects of England should be forever free of any oath, test, or subscription contrary to the
⁹⁴
doctrine of the Church of England. The Act of Union was read a third time, on 28 February, when the Tories resisted to the last, but were heavily defeated by 274 to 116 votes, with Arthur Annesley and Charles Caesar, both

90 Lords' Debates, ii, 178 and Lords' Journals, xviii, 268. All seventeen peers of the defeated minority signed the protest. They were Abingdon, Anglesey, Beaufort, Buckingham, Granville, Guernsey, Guilford, Leigh, North and Grey, Northampton, Nottingham, Scarsdale, Stawell, Thanet, Weymouth, Winchelsea, and the bishop of Bath and Wells.

91 Ibid., xviii, 268. The dissenting peers were Anglesey, Beaufort, Buckingham, Granville, Guernsey, Guilford, Leigh, Northampton, Nottingham, Scarsdale, Stawell, Thanet, Weymouth, and Winchelsea.

92 Commons' Debates, iv, 54.

93 Commons' Journals, xv, 283.

94 Ibid., xv, 307. The tellers for the minority were [Arthur] Annesley and [Dixie] Windsor, both Tories.

tackers, acting as tellers for the minority. The Court had received staunch support for the Union from the Whigs, and in this instance the Court Tories had no real misgivings. It was Feiling's view that "on no single public question were Harley's exertions so great, or his record so consistent, as on the Union, and with this forlorn anti-unionist sniping
96
he was entirely out of sympathy."

-
- 95 Ibid., xv, 317. Among the Tory minority was John Sharp, the son of the archbishop of York Bodleian Library. Ballard Ms. 7, f. 7 v. Dr. Smalridge to Dr. Charlett, 2 Mar. 1706/7.
- 96 Feiling, p. 391. For a contrary view see Dr. W. A. Shaw's bitter condemnation of Harley in Calendar of Treasury Books, 1711, xxv, part i, pp. lxvi-lxvii. Harley did infuriate the Scots and embroiled the Court over the commercial implications of the act. Merchants were exporting tobacco to Scotland, gaining the draw-back duty, and then planning to bring the tobacco into England after the 1 May 1707. Others were importing goods into Scotland, planning to bring them into England after this date and so avoiding the higher English import duties. Harley introduced measures to defeat these schemes. They were dropped after arousing considerable opposition. See Prussian Mss. 32 C, f. 117. Bonet's dispatch to Berlin, dated London, 11/22 April 1707; H.M.C., Eighth Report, app. I, ii, 395 a. Peter Shakerley's postscript to the merchants of Chester, dated Westminster, 9 April 1707; H.M.C., Townshend Mss., p. 332. Edward Ashe to Lord Townshend, London, 10 April 1707; A.J.D.M. McInnes, 'Robert Harley, Secretary of State', University of Wales M.A. thesis (1961), p. 109; Liverpool Public Library. Norris papers. 920 NOR I, 330. Tho. Johnson to Richard Norris, London, 18 April 1707; Carlisle Record Office. Lonsdale papers. D/Lons/12. Sir James Lowther to William Gilpin, London, 22 April 1707; Alexander Cunningham, The History of Great Britain (London, 1787), ii, 69-70; Huntington Library, California, Stowe Ms. ST. 57, i, ff. 94-96, James Brydges to William Cadogan, 10 April 1707; and Boyer's Annals, v, 481.

Robert Harley and Henry St. John had begun to show concern at the drift of the Court towards the Whigs. St. John had broached the subject of reopening contacts with the Tories, but for much of the 1706-7 session, he and Harley had supported the Court. The duchess of Marlborough did not trust either of them, and as early as October 1706 Godolphin had told Marlborough that "52 [the duchess] told me this morning, and promised to write so to Freeman [Marlborough] that 76 [Harley], 61 [St. John] and one or two more of 90's [your] particular friends were underhand endeavouring to bring all difficulties they could think of, upon the public business in the next sessions."⁹⁷ It is unlikely that at this early stage Harley had resolved to oppose the Court or to rejoin the main body of the Tories. He was still campaigning to work with the moderates of both parties. Brydges told the lord treasurer that Harley

"fears he shall not be able to comply with everything that ye whigs will be pushing at, if not prevented by some stand that must be made. That there's no way to do that, but by closing in opposition to ye whigs, with whatever shall be propos'd by such Gentlemen, who, tho' hitherto they have appeared against ye Queen's affaires, yet are not esteem'd to be of ye warmest sort and by that meanes endeavour to raise a third party yt may be sufficient to carry on such measures as you shall think fitting to take, without depending so much upon ye support of ye whigs."⁹⁸

Harley could not have been pleased with the changes in the spring of 1707,

97 B.M.Add.Ms. 9097, ff. 92-93. Godolphin to Marlborough, 18/29 Oct. 1706.

98 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Ms. ST. 57, i, f. 46. Letter without date [Nov. 1706?].

which heralded a further swing to the Whigs. The Tory, Sir Edward Northey, was removed as attorney-general, and, though he was succeeded by Sir Simon Harcourt, the latter's place as solicitor-general went to the Whig, Sir James Montague. The Tory, Edward Nicholas, who had voted with the Court in both 1705 and 1706, lost his position, as treasurer to Prince George, to the Whig, Spencer Compton. Less surprisingly Dixie Windsor, who had opposed the Union, lost his troop of horse.⁹⁹ After the Union the privy council had been reconstituted and all the leading Tories, who had been on the last council, were removed. These included Abingdon, Buckingham, Ferrers, Gower, Granville, Guernsey, Jersey, Northampton, Nottingham, Peterborough, Rochester, Thanet, Weymouth, Sir Edward Seymour, Sir George Rooke, and Sir Nathan Wright. Among the new privy councillors were Bolton, Bradford, Carlisle, Cholmondeley, Coningsby, Scarborough, Somerset, Sunderland, Wharton, Thomas Erle, and James Vernon; all Whigs.¹⁰⁰ Yet despite these changes Harley still thought that he had sufficient influence with the Queen to thwart the Junto dictating to the Court and that enough Tories might still be persuaded to support the Court's war policy. A letter from St. John made it clear that Harley did indeed have the warm regard of the Queen: "When I waited on the Queen yesterday she enquired after your health and expressed her concern for your illness in such terms as I am sure came from the bottom of her heart."¹⁰¹ Unfortunately the Tories were not so receptive to Harley's

99 Luttrell, vi, 165-6. 26 April 1707.

100 Lists in Leicester Record Office, Finch Mss., box vi, bundle 22.

101 H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 157. St. John to Harley, 30 Jan. 1706/7.

blandishments: "Harley, and his friends St. John and Harcourt, took great pains on the leaders of the Tories (in particular on Hanmer, Bromley, and Freeman) to engage them in the Queen's interests; assuring them, that her heart was with them, that she was weary of the tyranny of the Whigs, and longed to be delivered from it. But they were not wrought on by that management; they either mistrusted it, as done only to ensnare them, or they had other views, which they did not think fit to own."¹⁰²

Harley had the Queen's ear largely through the influence of Abigail Hill, later Lady Masham, the new royal favourite who was beginning to replace the duchess of Marlborough in the Queen's affections. Throughout the summer of 1707 the letters of Marlborough, his wife, and Godolphin, were full of insinuations that Harley was too much in the Queen's confidence and was trying to resist the advancement of the Whigs at every turn.¹⁰³ Harley did his utmost to discount these damaging rumours and to reaffirm his loyalty to Marlborough and Godolphin.¹⁰⁴ St. John, who must have been privy to Harley's schemes since he agreed with his general view of the political situation and they were on close

¹⁰² Burnet, v, 340.

¹⁰³ See, for example, Coxe, iii, 271-280. Godolphin to Marlborough, 24 June, n.s.; Marlborough to Godolphin, 11 July; Marlborough to his wife, 11 and 21 July 1707.

¹⁰⁴ Hardwicke State Papers (London, 1778), ii, 483. See H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 179-186. Harley to Godolphin, 2 Sept. 1707; Godolphin to Harley, 9 Sept.; Harley to Godolphin, 10 and 17 Sept.; Godolphin to Harley, 18 and 25 Sept.; Marlborough to Harley, 7 Oct.; Harley to Marlborough, 16 Oct. 1707.

personal terms, was also full of professions of continued devotion to Marlborough. Like Harley he was still hoping to steer a middle course between the Scylla of the Junto Whigs and the Charybdis of the high Tories. In July 1707 he wrote to Marlborough: "I hope in a week or ten days time to go into ye countys where I have some acquaintance and friends, and att my return will acquaint your Grace as far as I am able to discover in what disposition I find people - I may venture to say in general that the greatest part have a mind to be quiet, if busy people will suffer them to be so."¹⁰⁵ Ten days later he was writing from Bucklebury: "All people here are quiet, and we enjoy ye appearance of a perfect calm - a very little will keep it so, and a very little will ruffle ye waters."¹⁰⁶ Shortly before the opening of the new session St. John still appeared willing to support the existing alignment of Court forces: "We have many new characters this sessions to deal with & Party seems to be as restless as ever, tho a man would be apt to think that one side has had experience enough to make them sober, and the other countenance enough to make them satisfied. The greatest part of my time in the country has been spent in looking after my farms. I find the people I have conversed with poor but hearty & the landed Interest which is bowed under the Burthen of Taxes is still willing to pay them."¹⁰⁷ In

105 B.M.Add.Ms. 9100, ff. 100-101. To Marlborough, Whitehall, 25 July 1707.

106 Ibid., f. 138. St. John to Marlborough, Bucklebury, 4 Aug. 1707.

107 Ibid., f. 223. St. John to Marlborough, Bucklebury, 12 Oct. 1707.

the coming session, however, the Court was to move closer to the Whigs. This left Harley and St. John even further out on a limb, cut off from the trunk of the Tory party.

The Whigs were in no mood to continue bolstering a Court that threatened to appoint Tories to the vacant bishoprics of Chester and Exeter. They planned to scotch Harley's plans for greater reliance on the Tories by showing that they held the whip hand in parliament. Plans were laid to harass the ministry on all fronts until substantial concessions were wrung from the Court. On 12 November Lord Wharton led an attack on the admiralty for neglecting to provide adequate convoys to safeguard merchant shipping. The attack was aimed principally at Admiral George Churchill, who had Tory leanings, but the Whigs were also anxious to oust Harley.¹⁰⁸ The Tory peers, Buckingham, Guernsey, and Rochester, joined in the attack. The Junto later presented petitions from 154 merchants, demanding better naval protection. On the 14th the Tories, in particular Haversham and Rochester, joined in the debate and tried to turn it into a general attack on the ministry. The Whigs were not anxious to be linked with the Tories and Lord Wharton himself moved for an adjournment.¹⁰⁹ In the Commons there was even less enthusiasm for the inquiry into admiralty maladministration and the attacks petered out

108 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Ms. ST. 57, f. 248. James Brydges to William Cadogan, 15 Oct. 1707.

109 Lords' Debates, ii, 180-2, and Berkshire Record Office, Trumbull Ms., vol. lii, Ralph Bridges to Sir William Trumbull, 14 Nov. 1707.

for the time being on 13 December. Some Tories joined in the Whig attacks on the Court,¹¹⁰ though others, including the Herne and Heysham brothers, all merchants, declared in favour of the admiralty.¹¹¹

The Court came under fiercer attack over the administration of Scotland. Both parties¹¹² supported a move by the Scottish members to abolish the separate privy council, which gave the Court great influence in Scotland. Harley and Harcourt were prepared to defend the Court on this occasion,¹¹³ though there is no record of St. John doing so. The opposition, which apparently included most of the Scots and all the Tories,¹¹⁴ successfully rejected the Court's attempt to defeat the

110 Leeds City Library. Temple Newsam Mss., box 10. William Thompson to Lord Irwin, London, 16 Dec. 1707.

111 Vernon Corr., ed. James, iii, 287. Vernon to Shrewsbury, 6 Dec. 1707.

112 Carlisle Record Office. Lonsdale Mss. Miscellaneous Wharton papers. H.M. [Henry Mordaunt?] to Lord Wharton, Nov. 1707. According to the writer, a Whig, "the Torys were very silent, and left all the play to us." However, according to Alexander Cunningham, The History of Great Britain, ii, 137, Bromley opened the debate supported by George Baillie. But Cunningham, p. 138, also claimed that Harley changed his mind and voted for the abrogation of the Scottish privy council.

113 H.M.C., Lonsdale Mss., p. 118. Tho. Hopkins to Lord Wharton, 29 Nov. 1707; Vernon Corr., ed. James, iii, 294-296, Vernon to Shrewsbury, 4 Dec. 1707 (not the 14 Dec. as James claimed; this has been checked with the originals among the Buccleugh papers at Broughton House); and the duke of Manchester, Court and Society from Elizabeth to Anne (London, 1864), ii, 266-267, Joseph Addison to Lord Manchester, 6 Dec. (not Nov. as in text) 1707.

114 Prussian Mss. 33 B, ff. 14 v - 15 v. Bonet's dispatch to Berlin, dated London, 12/23 Dec. 1707. See also Vernon Corr., ed. James, iii, 290-292. Vernon to Shrewsbury, 11 Dec. 1707. Some Scots were won over by the Court to oppose the abolition of the Scottish privy council, since they found it a fertile field for themselves and their friends. This was especially so among the Scottish peers. See the very detailed letter of the earl of Loudoun to William Carstares, hoping that the assembly of the Church of Scotland would not press the Court to abolish the Scottish privy council. He claimed Queensberry, Mar and Seafield

proposals for the reform of the Scottish administration.¹¹⁵ Four of these, including that to abolish the privy council on 1 May, were incorporated in a bill which passed both Houses during January and February 1708. The successful opposition was composed of Scots, Tories, and Whigs. In the Lords, for example, the Court found itself opposed by Halifax and Somers, by Nottingham and Rochester, by Roxburgh and other Scottish peers, and by nearly all the bishops.¹¹⁶ The result was complete confusion facing the Court. Joseph Addison described the final debate in the Lords:

"My Lord Treasurer spoke against it and my Lord Sunderland for it. The Lord Chancellor [Cowper] spoke long and warmly on my Lord Treasurer's opinion and my Lord Sommers as much in the contrary. Lds Halifax and Wharton went with my Lord Sommers, Lds Townshend and Kingston with the other. The Bp. of Salisbury spoke very much against the Tyranny of a P[ri]vy Council in Scotland and was followed in his vote as I am inform'd by all the Bps except Winchester and Oxford. The E. of Rochester was for the Bill, and the D. of Buckingham against it. In short it looks as if everyone in this great National concern was resolv'd to vote as he thought best for his country without any regard to party."¹¹⁷

agreed with him. Edinburgh University Library. Laing Mss. (not included in H.M.C., Laing Mss., ii), II, no. 577. Letter dated 30 Dec. 1708 (mistake for 1707).

115 The five proposals were for the abolition of the Scottish privy council; for putting the Scottish militia on the same foot as that in England; for giving Scottish J.P.s the same powers as those in England; for sending Scottish judges on circuit twice a year; and for allowing Scottish sheriffs to act as returning officers in elections.

116 Prussian Mss. 33 B, f. 61. Bonet's dispatch to Berlin, dated London, 6/17 Feb. 1707/8; Carlisle Public Library. Bishop Nicolson's diaries, diary for 1707-8, f. 91, 5 Feb. 1707/8; H.M.C., Mar and Kellie Mss., i, 426-427. The earl of Mar to Lord Grange, 5 Feb. 1707/8; The Letters of Addison, ed. W. Graham (Oxford, 1941), p. 89. Joseph Addison to the earl of Manchester, Cockpit, 6 Feb. 1707/8.

117 The Letters of Addison, ed. W. Graham, p. 90. Letter dated 7 Feb. 1707/8. The bill was passed by 52 to 45 votes. Prussian Mss. 33 B, f. 63. Bonet's dispatch to Berlin, dated London, 10/21 Feb. 1707/8.

The Marlborough - Godolphin administration, unable to count upon any loyal support in this troubled session was particularly alarmed when the whole conduct of the war, which had become the very raison d'être of the ministry, came under criticism from both sides. As secretary of war Henry St. John was particularly embroiled in these debates. One such issue was the question of raising further recruits for the war, St. John's special province. On 12 January 1708 the Commons resolved to discuss ways
118 of raising further recruits; St. John making no specific proposals. Four days later the House again considered ways of filling up the depleted regiments in Spain, but once more the secretary at war seemed unable to suggest specific measures. He admitted that nineteen thousand men would be needed, but thought fourteen thousand would suffice at present. "The Country Gentlemen immediately call'd upon him for his Expedient to raise the number proposed which it was not thought proper to Communicate at that time. This a little displeas'd several who were dissatisfied likewise
119 that this matter had not been laid before them much sooner." Next day, the 17th, St. John proposed to raise men again from the counties and parishes, proportionately throughout the kingdom. The chancellor of the exchequer, Henry Boyle, spoke well in defence of these proposals, but they met with opposition. Sir Thomas Hanmer was against any levies being raised in England and wanted to use only hired troops, but his views were

118 Commons' Journals, xv, 493.

119 The Letters of Addison, ed. W. Graham, p. 87. Joseph Addison to the earl of Manchester, Cockpit, 24 Jan. 1707/8.

not seconded. On 20 January the Country Whigs joined with the Tories¹²⁰ and defeated St. John's proposals by 185 to 177 votes. The next day Sir Simon Harcourt tried to retrieve the situation by suggesting a few¹²¹ minor changes to the committee's resolutions on recruiting. The committee had merely resolved to raise recruits from "such Persons, as have no lawful Calling or Employment, or do not follow the same, or have no visible Means of Maintenance and Livelihood." Harcourt's amendments changed this to "such Persons, as have no lawful Calling or Employment, or do not follow the same, or have not any Estate, real or personal, for their Maintenance and Livelihood, or any lawful Means of Livelihood by their own¹²² Labour, or Allowance from their Parents." This gave very little additional latitude, but Henry St. John appeared entirely without any other expedients. The Court as a whole was at a loss. When, the same day, a recruiting bill¹²³ was ordered St. John was not included among those who were to prepare it. It was not until two days later that the oversight was remedied and St. John¹²⁴ was added to the list. That day, the 23rd, it was resolved to offer incentives to raise recruits. Parish officers were to be allowed twenty shillings for each new recruit and every volunteer was to receive a bounty

120 Ibid., pp. 87-88. Addison to the earl of Manchester, Cockpit, 24 Jan. 1707/8, and Vernon Corr., ed. James, iii, 318, Vernon to Shrewsbury, 20 Jan. 1707/8.

121 The Letters of Addison, ed. W. Graham, p. 88. Addison to the earl of Manchester, 24 Jan. 1707/8.

122 Commons' Journals, xv, 508.

123 Ibid.

124 Ibid., xv, 512.

of four pounds.¹²⁵ The amendments were again the work of Harcourt and
not St. John.¹²⁶ Addison remarked that "it is hoped likewise, that
there will be some Additions made to it when the bill passes in the House
and such as cannot but render it Effectual. This affaire having bin
look'd upon as one of the most dangerous to the Common Cause had it not
Ended well."¹²⁷ It was not until 27 January that the recruiting bill
emerged for its first reading.¹²⁸ Before it became law St. John was out
of office.

The administration had found itself under attack from both
Whigs and Tories on many fronts during this difficult 1707-8 session.
The greatest attack, however, because it challenged the ministry's war
policies, came on the conduct of operations in Spain. In April 1707 the
earl of Galway and the allied army had suffered a severe defeat at the
battle of Almanza. The earl of Peterborough, who had been recalled from
Spain, claimed that this defeat could have been avoided. This helped to
bring the whole question into the political arena.¹²⁹ In the Lords both
Whigs and Tories attacked the ministry's conduct of the war in Spain.

125 Ibid.

126 The Letters of Addison, ed. W. Graham, p. 88. Addison to Manchester,
24 Jan. 1707/8.

127 Ibid.

128 Commons' Journals, xv, 516. The bill was presented by Richard Topham,
a Whig.

129 For the debates on the conduct of the war in Spain, and the background
of the military events leading to it, see my dissertation, 'British
Military and Naval Operations in Catalonia and Valencia, 1705-10',
unpublished University of Durham M.A. (1963).

Nottingham brought forward the old Tory argument that too much effort was
being made in Flanders, to the detriment of the operations in Spain. ¹³⁰

Marlborough challenged this and told the House that it was hoped to
augment the forces in Spain and to persuade Prince Eugene to command
them. ¹³¹

This persuaded the Whigs to support a resolution "that no Peace
can be honourable or safe, for Her Majesty and Her Allies, if Spain and the
Spanish West Indies be suffered to continue in the Power of the House of
Austria." ¹³²

No decision was reached on Peterborough's conduct in
Spain. ¹³³

It was in the Commons, however, that the inquiry into the conduct
of the war in Spain reached alarming proportions and eventually proved the
occasion of the fall of Harley and St. John. On 8 December Colonel James
Grahme, a personal friend of St. John but in opposition to the Court, asked
for information about the number of troops in Spain and Portugal at the
time of the battle of Almanza. Five days later St. John gave an account
of the regiments in Spain, and Grahme then moved for an adjournment. ¹³⁴
On the 18th the House moved for details of the actual number of troops in
the English regiments or those in English pay, but again Grahme got St. John

¹³⁰ Cobbett's Parliamentary History, vi, 605-606.

¹³¹ Ibid., vi, 607.

¹³² Lords' Journals, xviii, 395.

¹³³ The inquiry into Peterborough's conduct and the war in Spain was not
resumed until 1711. See, infra, pp. 445-6.

¹³⁴ Boughton House. Buccleugh Mss. Vernon/Shrewsbury Correspondence,
vol. iv, letter 171. Vernon to Shrewsbury, 13 Dec. 1707. The
letter in Vernon Corr., ed. James, iii, 292, has several omissions.

off the hook by moving for an adjournment until 17 January.¹³⁵ Grahme's rôle seems inexplicable. He had initiated the inquiry, but then twice hindered it proceeding further. It can only be conjectured that St. John let his friend know that the inquiry was a source of embarrassment to him and Grahme thought he ought to save the secretary at war from the troublesome inquiry he had inadvertently initiated. Before the investigation was renewed many papers were presented to the Commons. On 12 January St. John gave a list of the number of troops in English pay at the time of the battle of Almanza, which totalled 8,660 men.¹³⁶ Four days afterwards James Brydges, the paymaster of the forces abroad, presented his accounts for maintaining 29,395 troops in Spain and Portugal up to 23 December 1707.¹³⁷ The accounts cover two full pages of the Commons' Journals and the troop figures, split into 20,562 and 8,833, were not given any special prominence. This, and the fact that they were presented four days after St. John's figures, probably explains why their significance was not immediately grasped. It seems likely, however, that both Harley and St. John were aware of the explosive nature of these figures, but did nothing to enlighten the House at this stage. Though the Commons began reading the papers on the war in Spain and Portugal on 17 January it was not until the 29th that the debate on the conduct of the war really began. Then Sir Thomas Hanmer sprang to the attack. Why, he

135 Ibid., iii, 298-99. Vernon to Shrewsbury, 18 Dec. 1707.

136 Commons' Journals, xv, 491.

137 Ibid., xv, 500-501.

demanded, were there only 8,660 troops at Almanza, when parliament had arranged to pay for no less than 29,395 men? St. John was caught unprepared. He made various excuses that his figure of 8,660 men referred only to effective troops, that it did not include officers, prisoners of war, or the sick in hospital, and that it omitted the four regiments that had recently been sent to Portugal.¹³⁸ James Brydges and Robert Harley joined in defending the ministry,¹³⁹ which, hard pressed, had to depend on the Whigs for narrowly securing an adjournment until 3 February.¹⁴⁰ The attack was left to the Tories.

The lame defence made by St. John, followed, as it was, within a few days by the fall of Harley and St. John for acting against the Godolphin ministry, has led some historians to suggest that the two men had acted in collusion with the Tories to undermine the administration. It was argued that St. John and Harley were aware of the great discrepancy between Brydges' figures and those of the secretary at war, whereas the Tories had not spotted the difference immediately. From this it was suggested that Harley and St. John had deliberately primed the Tory opposition with these explosive figures in order to destroy the ministry.¹⁴¹ The view was first put forward by Carl von Noorden. It was adopted

138 Vernon Corr., ed. James, 111, 329. Vernon to Shrewsbury, 29 Jan. 1707/8.

139 Luttrell, vi, 262. 31 Jan. 1708.

140 Commons' Journals, xv, 520. The vote was 182 to 172. The tellers were Lord Coningsby and Robert Walpole for the majority and Sir Thomas Hanmer and Arthur Annesley for the opposition.

141 Europäische Geschichte in Achtzehnten Jahrhundert (Leipzig, 1883), 111, 219-220.

wholeheartedly by W. S. Churchill, and by Sir Charles Petrie, and, with
reservations, by G. M. Trevelyan.¹⁴² This thesis has been seriously
undermined by two articles, 'The Fall of Harley in 1708', by Godfrey
Davies, and an important recent article, 'The Fall of Harley in 1708
reconsidered', by G. S. Holmes and W. A. Speck.¹⁴³ It only needs to be
added here that Noorden's whole case rested upon the report of Bonet to
the Prussian Court, which the writers of these two articles were not able
to consult. When it is examined it shows that Bonet did not state as a
fact that there was collusion and the report was written on 13 February,
by which time Harley had fallen after challenging the authority of
Godolphin. It is worth quoting Bonet's exact words: "On veut que le
Secrétaire des Guerres St. Jean n'agi en cette rencontre que par les
insinuations du Sieur de Harley, qui est son oracle. On a crû remarquer
en cette rencontre que celui ci travailloit à unir les Gentilhommes des
Provinces avec les Tories contre le Ministère."¹⁴⁴

On 3 February the debate on Spain was resumed and St. John
produced further figures to account for the discrepancy between the troops
for whom parliament had voted and the number of effectives in Spain at
the time of Almanza. His detailed account gave several explanations:
six regiments had been sent home to recruit before the battle had taken

142 Marlborough: His Life and Times, 111, 351-352; Bolingbroke, pp. 95-96;
and England under Queen Anne, 11, 327.

143 E. H. R. (1951), 1xvi, 246-254 and (1965), 1xxx, 673-698.

144 Prussian Mss. 33 B, ff. 69 v - 70. Bonet's dispatch to Berlin, dated
London, 13/24 Feb. 1707/8. Cf. Bonet's dispatch of 6/17 Feb. 1707/8.
Ibid., 33 B, f. 58.

place; 2,800 men had been lost on the voyage out to Spain with Earl Rivers in 1706/7; 2,160 men were in Portugal at the time of the battle; 2,000 had been captured before the battle, etc. In this way he reduced the discrepancy to a mere 801 men.¹⁴⁵ The Commons, now roused to great heights of moral indignation, refused to accept St. John's account as providing a complete justification of the discrepancy and only agreed to add the number of officers and their servants to the figure of 8,660 effective troops. G. S. Holmes and W. A. Speck have conjectured that Harley did not speak in this debate. Bonet reported that both Harley and Harcourt attempted unsuccessfully to moderate the temper of the debate, while Spanheim claimed that Harley had not taken the Court's side with any great vigour.¹⁴⁶ The Tories, led by Bromley and Hanmer, moved a resolution complaining of the discrepancy of over twenty thousand men and asking the Queen for an adequate explanation.¹⁴⁷ On this occasion the Godolphin ministry was not saved by the Junto, who "wanted at this time so

145 Commons' Journals, xv, 524-525. For his speech see Vernon Corr., ed. James, 111, 335-336. Vernon to Shrewsbury, 3 Feb. 1707/8. St. John's own memorandum of these figures can be seen in B. M. Add. Ms. 22,264, ff. 16-18. For a modern justification of St. John's defence see L. F. Burton, 'The Supply of Infantry for the War in the Peninsula, 1703-1707'. Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. (1955), xxviii, 35-58.

146 Prussian Mss. 33 B, f. 58. Bonet's dispatch to Berlin, dated London, 6/17 Feb. 1707/8; and 33 A, f. 75. Spanheim's dispatch to Berlin, dated London, 10/21 Feb. 1707/8. These dispatches do not contravert the general thesis of Messrs. Holmes and Speck. On the contrary they show that while Harley was unhappy at the figures and at the general drift of the ministry to the Whigs he was not acting in collusion with the Tories actually to overthrow the Godolphin ministry.

147 Commons' Journals, xv, 525.

fair an opportunity to bite the ministers, and force them into a compliance with what they had long been bargaining for, and therefore directed their creatures by all means to let the Address pass as smart as the Tories would have it." ¹⁴⁸

The Godolphin ministry had now had warnings in several important debates that its survival depended on strengthening its basis of party support. Attacked by both Whigs and Tories on major issues the Court had to buy off one or the other with concessions in the form of offices and places. The famous Almanza debate has been seen as the last straw. ¹⁴⁹

Yet there had been a major struggle within the ministry for some months over which party the Court should turn to for greater support.

As we have seen Harley, with whom St. John was in agreement, had been anxious since 1706 for some kind of rapprochement with the Tories. Harley felt the Court would need to make fewer concessions to placate the Tories, who could be prevented from dictating to the Court. The Whig Junto, on the other hand, would probably insist on shaping policy once they controlled the chief ministerial posts. ¹⁵⁰ After the traumatic experience of the tack in 1704 Godolphin had become convinced that the Tories could not be trusted to support the war. He believed that supplies for the war could only be voted with the support of the Whigs, though he hoped to obtain their votes without too many concessions. Despite a blunt letter from

148 'Faults on Both Sides', Somers Tracts, xiii, 693.

149 Godfrey Davies, 'The Fall of Harley in 1708'. E.H.R. (1951), lxvi, 246-254.

150 G. S. Holmes and W. A. Speck, 'The Fall of Harley in 1708 reconsidered'. E.H.R. (1965), lxxx, 681-682.

Godolphin¹⁵¹ the Queen continued to be obstinate and in January 1708, perhaps at the instigation of Harley, she appointed two Tories, Offspring Blackall and Sir William Dawes, to the bishoprics of Exeter and Chester, but allowed a Whig, Charles Trimmel, to go to Norwich. This not only infuriated the Whigs, but helped to bring into the open the sharp division of opinion within the ministry of its two leading politicians, Godolphin and Harley. The lord treasurer had virtually shaken off any misgivings about allying with the Whigs. Robert Harley, and the other Court Tories, were not only resisting the entry of the Whigs into high ministerial posts, but were now actively pro-Tory. By early January 1708 Harley was convinced of the urgent need to reshape the ministry by bringing in more Tories. The situation in parliament was virtually out of control and he had begun to fear a Whig attack on himself after his secretary Greg had been arrested for engaging in treasonable correspondence with France. After Harley's fall in February Joseph Addison wrote of this scheme: "It is said Mr. Harley and his friends had laid schemes to undermine most of our great offices of state and plant their own party in the room of 'em. If we may believe common fame he himself was to have bin a peer and Ld Treasurer, tho' others say the Ld R[ocheste]r was designed for that post. Mr. Harcourt was to have bin Ld Chancellour, Mr. St. John Secretary of State, the Duke of Buckingham Ld Privy Seal and so on."¹⁵² Two weeks later he corrected himself and said

151 B. M. Add. Ms. 34518, f. 102. Letter dated 11 Sept. 1707, and H. M. C., Eighth Report, 1, app., p. 41.

152 The Letters of Addison, ed. W. Graham, p. 91. To the earl of Manchester, 13 Feb. 1707/8.

Rochester and Bromley were not in the scheme, though Hanmer was to come
in. St. John was still mentioned for promotion to secretary of state. ¹⁵³

This suggests that Harley was still willing to exclude the less tractable
Tories. Harley always denied this Whig charge of treachery towards
Godolphin, but he could not deny that he had long advocated a reconciliation
with some at least of the Tories.

Harley had in fact planned the reshaping of the ministry in
consultation with both Marlborough and Godolphin. Years later Swift wrote
that Harley and St. John had told him "that the Duke of Marlborough and the
Earl of Godolphin had concerted with them and their friends upon a
moderating scheme, wherein some of both parties should be employed, but with
a more favourable aspect towards the Church: that a meeting was appointed
for completing this work." ¹⁵⁴ This meeting took place on 14 January

¹⁵⁵
1708. Bishop Burnet seems to admit that both Marlborough and Godolphin
were in on the scheme. Harley, he wrote, "set it about among the Tories,
as well as among the Whigs, that both the Duke of Marlborough and the Lord
Treasurer were as much inclined to come into the measures with the Tories as
the Queen herself was: this broke out, and was like to have had very ill
effects; it had almost lost them the Whigs, though it did not bring over the
Tories." ¹⁵⁶ Whatever the outcome of his meeting with Marlborough and

153 Ibid., p. 95. To Manchester, 27 Feb. 1707/8.

154 'Memoirs relating to the change ... in the Queen's Ministry in the
Year 1710'. Swift's Prose Works, viii, 113.

155 See Harley's memorandum, B.M. Portland (Harley) papers, loan 29/9/51.
Cited by G. S. Holmes and W. A. Speck, 'The Fall of Harley in 1708
reconsidered'. E.H.R. (1965), lxxx, 683.

156 Burnet, v, 351.

Godolphin, Harley began quietly approaching the Tories. On 4 February 1708 Sir John Cropley reported that "Harley has at last secur'd a good reception with ye Torys and his friends Harcourt, St. Johns, & all yt crew to stand & fall with him ... I do believe ye Whigs will carry their point but tis not yet done. The partys are both so potent & equally determin'd ye Court shall have done wth all trimming." ¹⁵⁷ Harley's manoeuvres were clearly becoming common knowledge for James Vernon told the duke of Shrewsbury of a rumour

"publicly spoken of, that messages have been carried as from the Queen to several leading men among the Tory party, to engage them to stand by her Majesty against the Whigs, whose management she was dissatisfied with, and no less with the influence they had upon her ministers. This is laid to the charge of Mr. Attorney [Harcourt] and Mr. St. John, but more particularly the latter, so that they are looked upon as a triumvirate that were framing a new scheme of administration, and Mrs. Hill, the dresser, is said to be engaged with them in the project. She is now known by the name of Mrs. Masham." ¹⁵⁸

After the fall of Harley the Hanoverian resident, De Beyries, claimed that the Queen had commanded Harley and his friends to act with the Tories or ¹⁵⁹ malcontent Whigs to build up support. Since these negotiations with the Tories were in opposition to the expressed views of Godolphin it would seem that Harley, despite his denials, was prepared to oust the lord

157 P. R. O., Shaftesbury papers, 30/24/21/145. To Lord Shaftesbury, 4 Feb. 1707/8.

158 Vernon Corr., ed. James, iii, 345. To Shrewsbury, 10 Feb. 1707/8.

159 De Beyries' dispatch to Hanover, dated London, 13/24 Feb. 1707/8. Cited by B. W. Hill, 'The Career of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, from 1702 to 1714', unpublished Cambridge Ph.D. thesis (1961), p. 142.

treasurer. Shocked at the revelations in the Almanza debate of the gross discrepancy in the number of troops voted for and actual present in Spain he may have used the information to damage Godolphin's standing with the Queen.¹⁶⁰

There was no such plan to displace Marlborough, who, while the war continued, was regarded as indispensable. According to Lord Coningsby's account, written years afterwards, Marlborough feared Whig domination and had a natural "inclination to the Tories, and more particularly to St. John, Harcourt and Mansell (and at this instant, even to Harley himself)."¹⁶¹ Godolphin got wind of Harley's intrigues and¹⁶² complained to Marlborough. The commander informed Harley of the lord treasurer's suspicions and Harley wrote to Marlborough on 28 January to¹⁶³ deny any charge of treachery. The lord treasurer was not satisfied with this denial, and, on 29 January, when Harley and St. John were desperately trying to explain the discrepancy in the two figures for troops in Spain, he wrote to accuse the secretary of state of base treachery. Harley replied next day: "I never entertained the least thought derogating from your Lordship or prejudicial to your interest." Godolphin remained

160 G. S. Holmes and W. A. Speck, 'The Fall of Harley in 1708 reconsidered'. E.H.R. (1965), lxxx, 677-678.

161 'Lord Coningsby's account of the state of political parties during the reign of Queen Anne'. Archaeologia (London, 1860), xxxviii, 7.

162 It has been shown that Godolphin was convinced of Harley's treachery before the Almanza debate of 29 January. G. S. Holmes and W. A. Speck, 'The Fall of Harley in 1708 reconsidered'. E.H.R. (1965), lxxx, 675-676.

163 B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/12/5. Draft of Harley's letter to Marlborough, dated 28 Jan. 1708.

unconvinced and replied: "I am very far from having deserved it from you.
God forgive you."¹⁶⁴ Since it was the Whigs, who had rescued the ministry in the Almanza debate of 29 January by securing an adjournment, Harley realised Godolphin could justify his wish to gratify the Whigs. Consequently, when the debate was resumed on 3 February, Harley hoped the Tories would lead a devastating attack on the ministry, which would convince the lord treasurer that it was the Tories he had to conciliate. Unfortunately the Whigs overreached Harley and joined in the attack on the ministry with the Tories. This gave Godolphin the choice of which party he could buy off. Harley played his last card and sent St. John to persuade Marlborough to throw over the lord treasurer and rejoin the Tories.¹⁶⁵ The secretary at war was not without hope of success for, according to Swift, "the Queen told Mr. St. John a week ago, that she was resolved to part with Lord Treasurer; and sent him with a letter to the Duke of Marlborough, which she read to him, to that purpose; and she gave St. John leave to tell it about the town, which he did without any reserve."¹⁶⁶ After some thought Marlborough decided to stand by Godolphin and on 8 February he, his wife, and

164 H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 189-190. Harley to Godolphin, 29 Jan. and the reply, 30 Jan. 1708. See also Harley's memoranda and draft letters to Marlborough and Godolphin in B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/9/51, 29/12/5-6 and 29/64/1-3.

165 De Beyries' dispatch to Hanover, dated London, 13/24 Feb. 1707/8. Cited by B. W. Hill, 'The Career of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, from 1702 to 1714', unpublished Cambridge Ph.D. thesis (1961), p. 142.

166 Swift's Corr., i, 75. To Archbishop William King, 5 Feb. 1707/8.

the lord treasurer offered their joint resignation rather than serve with
167
Harley. Sir John Cropley reported to Lord Shaftesbury: "Lord

Mar[lborough] & Ld Treasurer after their friendsp for Mr. Harley have sent
ye Q[ueen] a message that unless she discards Mr. Harley her service they
can serve her no longer and they with due submission give her Maj[esty]
3 dayes to consider whether she will consider their faythfull services or
168
no."

Marlborough and Godolphin refused to attend the cabinet meeting
on Sunday, 8 February. When Harley tried to lead the cabinet discussions
on the war the duke of Somerset protested and left the meeting. Most of
the other members also refused to discuss the war in Marlborough's absence. 169
The moderate Whig members like Cowper, Devonshire, and Newcastle, urged the
170
Queen to part with Harley. In the Lords, on 9 February, Wharton moved
to enquire into Greg's treachery and seven peers were chosen to examine
Harley's clerk. All the peers were Whigs, namely Bolton, Devonshire,

167 Coxe, iv, 24.

168 P. R. O. Shaftesbury papers. 30/24/21/150. Letter of [19 Feb 1708].
Cf. "Harley was turn'd out just as (as report sais) he was within an
ace of triping up ye Treas[ure]r who they say had certainly fallen had
he not been propped up by the duke & it is reported yt they both
threatn'd to lay down unless Harley was discharged." Lincoln Record
Office. Massingberd papers, 20/75. Burrell Massingberd to William
Massingberd, 12 Feb. 1707/8.

169 Swift's Corr., i, 74-76. Swift to Archbishop King, 12 Feb. 1708;
Burnet, v, 354.

170 P. R. O. Shaftesbury papers, 30/24/21/146. Sir John Cropley to Lord
Shaftesbury, 7 Feb. 1707/8.

Halifax, Somers, Somerset, Townshend, and Wharton;¹⁷¹ a selection which must have alarmed Harley. In the Commons the supply bill was not proceeded with.¹⁷² Thus the Whigs had demonstrated their control of both Houses. The Queen gave way and John Clerk was able to report: "Tis generally believed that this will unite the Angry whigs, and tis thought if this had been done sooner, the half of the noise that has been this session had not happned."¹⁷³ On 11 February the Queen reluctantly accepted Harley's resignation and that of Thomas Mansell, the comptroller of the household. Next day Henry St. John and Sir Simon Harcourt followed them out of office. The ministry was now virtually devoid of Tory members. Of the other ten Tory placemen, who had voted with the Court in 1706, six lost their places before the end of 1708.¹⁷⁴ Other

171 Carlisle Public Library. Bishop Nicolson's diaries, diary for 1707-9, 9 Feb. 1708. The discovery of Greg's treachery was not the reason or even the veiled excuse for Harley's fall. It could have been used against him as early as December 1707, but it was not brought forward until the Whigs needed to back up Marlborough and Godolphin against Harley.

172 Burnet, v, 355.

173 Scottish Record Office. Clerk of Penicuik papers. GD 18/3140. John Clerk to his father, Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, London, 14 Feb. [1708].

174 Sir John Bland, commissioner of customs, and Edward Nicholas, treasurer to Prince George, had been turned out before 1708. In that year William Ettrick, council of the admiralty, Arthur Moore, comptroller of army accounts, Henry Paget, council of the admiralty, and Edward Southwell, secretary of state for Ireland, were all replaced. Sir Gilbert Dolben and Sir Thomas Powys held legal posts, which they retained. Edward Harley held a permanent post as auditor of the imprests. George Granville remained in the minor post of governor of Pendennis.

M.P.s who were Tory in sympathy and who had voted for the Court in 1706, were also replaced.¹⁷⁵

Henry St. John has often been accused of being a political adventurer, a man only interested in power, a man without political principles. Though there is much to say for this view it breaks down upon a detailed examination of St. John's resignation in 1708. He was not forced to resign. Indeed Marlborough, who held him in high regard, was anxious to persuade him to remain in office. Marlborough's favourite general, William Cadogan, wrote to James Brydges: "I am beyond expression concerned and surprised at our friend Harry St. John's resigning. I had a letter from him on that subject to justify the resolution he had taken. I am sorry he thought he had reason for it. I am sure the whole army and particularly those that know him will have reason to regret it."¹⁷⁶ Lord Raby expressed surprise at the news: "How comes it that Lord Treasurer and my lord Duke were so violent against Harley and all his party, for I thought you told me that Harry St. Johns and his gang were all entirely my lord Duke's."¹⁷⁷ Marlborough himself expressed regret at St. John's resignation.¹⁷⁸ Nor did St. John lose his personal regard for the great

175 Sir Charles Hedges had already been replaced as secretary of state in 1706. Charles Churchill retired from the army in 1708. Admiral George Churchill had lost his dominant position on the admiralty council. Courtiers like Thomas Coke and James Brydges naturally remained in office.

176 Letter dated Brussels, 8 Mar. 1707/8, n.s. Cited by Godfrey Davies, 'The Seamy Side of Marlborough's War'. Huntington Library Quarterly (1951), XV, i, 40.

177 The Wentworth Papers, p. 20. To William Cadogan, Berlin, 10 March 1708.

178 In later years he hoped they could maintain their good relations. The Letters and Dispatches of John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, ed. Sir George Murray, iv, 626, Marlborough to St. John, Camp at Havré, 14 Oct. 1709; and B.M.Add.Ms. 31143, ff. 586-87. Peter Wentworth to Lord Raby, 27 Oct. 1710.

commander. After the latter's great victory at Oudenarde St. John wrote to him: "I am preparing to return again to the country, in the midst of which retreat I shall inviolably preserve in my heart that gratitude for all favours, that zeal for your service, and that true unaffected love for your person, which I have never knowingly departed from."¹⁷⁹

Clearly St. John had not been forced to resign. But why had he chosen to do so? It is possible to take a cynical view and argue that St. John saw that it was not in his own best interests to remain in office. According to this view St. John had always believed that the Tory party represented the majority of the nation and so could not be long excluded from power. Moreover he must have been aware that Harley was replacing Marlborough and Godolphin as the Queen's political adviser, while Mrs. Masham was ousting the duchess of Marlborough as the royal favourite. Thus, it could be argued, that St. John envisaged the eventual triumph of Harley and the Tories, and that he himself would ride back to power on the crest of this wave. Though this did eventually materialise it was to take two and a half years of Tory scheming, and the unexpected failure of the ministry to make a satisfactory peace, to accomplish it. If St. John foresaw all this he had remarkable political judgement, a quality the same critics would deny him. Another possible explanation of St. John's resignation in 1708 was his horror at discovering the discrepancy between the number of troops voted by parliament for the service in Spain and

¹⁷⁹ The Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, ii, 292.
Letter dated London, 6/17 July 1708.

Portugal and the number actually engaged at Almanza. His consternation was certainly genuine as can be seen from his letter to Harley on 14 January 1708:

"Have received your letter of yesterday's date, with a copy of the address of the House of Commons to her Majesty for an account of the effective men of the Portuguese troops yearly since the treaty with Portugal, and of the number of them present at the battle of Almanza, or at that time in other parts of Spain or Portugal. Having never received any account, either from her Majesty's ministers or from the general officers serving abroad with those forces, of the condition or strength thereof, I am not able to make any return of what is required, unless I can receive information from any of the officers now in Britain who have served in Portugal and Spain, which I will endeavour to get."¹⁸⁰

Nevertheless, three factors militate against the theory that it was the conviction, that the ministry had seriously mismanaged the war, which led to his resignation. Firstly, the discrepancy between the two sets of figures could be explained. In his article, 'The Supply of Infantry for the war in the Peninsula, 1703-1707', I. F. Burton has shown that "all the missing men can be accounted for ... without any suggestion of the misappropriation of money."¹⁸¹ Moreover Mr. Burton's figures are substantially those which St. John himself presented to the Commons on 3 February 1708.¹⁸² The House may not have accepted the explanation, but St. John's defence was clearly sound. Secondly, if St. John was dissatisfied with the explanation of the discrepancy and believed they were meant to hide financial misdemeanours why did he not play a leading

¹⁸⁰ H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 189. Letter dated Whitehall, 14 Jan. 1707/8.

¹⁸¹ Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. (1955), xxviii, 56-57.

¹⁸² Commons' Journals, xv, 524-525 and B.M.Add.Ms. 22264, ff. 16-18.

part in exposing the ministry after his fall in February? Thirdly, St. John was at least partly responsible for the supply of troops to the peninsula. If he believed there had been gross inefficiency here then he would not have resigned or, after he done so, he would have tried to throw all the blame on his erstwhile colleagues. He did neither. The censure debate on Almanza was resumed on 24 February, after St. John's resignation. In this debate the ministry was now defended by the Whigs, who having seen the remnants of the Tory ministers expelled, could look forward to rich pickings. The opposition was now composed solely of Tories. John Ward and Sir Thomas Hanmer criticised the ministry for not supplying timely recruits. When the motion of censure came to the vote St. John, who had spoken only in his own defence, explaining that his figures made up most of the deficiency, decided to abstain.¹⁸³ On the other hand, Harley, who had read a book during the debate and didn't say a word, voted against the Court.¹⁸⁴ He was joined by Harcourt and Mansell.¹⁸⁵ The ministry defeated the censure motion by 230 to 175

183 Boughton House. Buccleugh Mss. Vernon/Shrewsbury correspondence, letter 193. Vernon to Shrewsbury, 24 Feb. 1707/8; The Letters of Addison, ed. W. Graham, p. 94. Addison to Lord Manchester, 24 Feb. 1707/8; and Prussian Mss. 33 B, ff. 82-85. Bonet's dispatch to Berlin, dated London, 27 Feb./9 Mar. 1707/8.

184 B.M.Add.Ms. 17677, CCC, f. 323. L'Hermitage's dispatch to The Hague, dated London, 9 Mar. 1708, n.s.

185 Boughton House. Buccleugh Mss. Vernon/Shrewsbury correspondence, letter 193, dated 24 Feb. 1707/8; and The Letters of Addison, ed. W. Graham, p. 94. To Lord Manchester, 24 Feb. 1707/8. According to James Harries, however, not only Harley, Harcourt, and Mansell, but also St. John "joined with their friends who rec[eive]d them with both arms, as strayed sheep come into the true fold." Bodleian Library. Ballard Ms. 39, f. 33. To Dr. Charlett, Temple, 24 Feb. 1707/8. Though St. John had returned to the Tory fold he did not vote with them on this occasion.

votes.¹⁸⁶

The most obvious explanation of St. John's resignation probably does him too much credit to satisfy his many critics. This is that he resigned because his political principles would not let him remain in a ministry that was going to be dominated by the Whigs. He was not prepared to cut himself adrift completely from his former Tory colleagues, whether moderates like Harley and Harcourt, or high-flyers like Bromley. This decision would imply at least a modicum of political principle. There is a great deal of evidence to support this hypothesis. Since 1704 he had followed Harley's lead in supporting a moderate ministry, relying to some extent on the reasonable elements in the Tory ranks. He had voiced misgivings about the choice of John Smith as Speaker in 1705 and he had approved of Harley's opening of tentative negotiations with the main body of the Tories in 1706. When Harley had been planning approaches to the Tories in January 1708 St. John had supported him¹⁸⁷ and had acted as his go-between with Marlborough. Thus when Harley's schemes failed St. John felt the only course open to him was to resign with him. This was the explanation James Brydges, a friend of St. John's, gave to Cadogan to clarify the reasons for St. John's and Harcourt's resignations:

186 Commons' Journals, xv, 569. The tellers for the Tory opposition were Ralph Freeman and Sir Thomas Hanmer.

187 Feiling, p. 400, suggests that the plan to oust Godolphin smacked of St. John's handiwork, but there is no evidence that he was anything more than Harley's willing aide.

"Ye reasons they give are because Mr. Harley was turn'd out, wch they lookt upon as a full declaration of the ministry's intentions to joyn entirely with ye whigs, wch they thought was inconsistent with ye declaration they had made to them, & ye assurances wch by ye authority & permission as also by ye Queen's commands they had given ye Tories that no such thing should be done."188

This seems the best explanation of St. John's decision to resign with Harley. It is fully consonant with his previous conduct and with his subsequent urging of Harley to reunite with the main body of the Tories.

188 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, iii, f. 18.
Letter dated 12 Feb. 1707/8.

Chapter Seven.

Retirement and Realignment.

With Harley, St. John, Harcourt, and Mansell out of the ministry it seemed that there would be an immediate realignment of forces. For months the ministry had faced attacks from both the Whigs and the Tories. Godolphin had urged the Queen to make concessions to the Whigs. He had succeeded in ousting Harley and was able to bring in moderate Whigs like Henry Boyle, as secretary of state, and John Smith, as chancellor of the exchequer. The Queen opposed bringing in the Junto, which infuriated these Whig leaders and left the ministry on a very narrow¹ bottom. Meanwhile, Harley, out of office, hoped to come to terms with the Tories in order to take over the leadership of the opposition. This was not accomplished without difficulty. According to Sir John Cropley the leadership of the Tories immediately fell to Harley upon his resignation. On 20 February 1708 he wrote to Lord Shaftesbury: "Mr. Harley has taken his old part ye management of ye house, ye tories his abject slaves. Mrs. Masham continues at Court & not a word I am told can be ventur'd to remove her. So yt door is open for Mr. Harley. No side doubts his personal credit with ye Q[ueen] nor ye little credit of ye Whigs."² A week later Harley received the congratulations of Charlwood Lawton: "I am very glad to find that the Church party so generally and so heartily take you by the hand, and believe me, it is in your power, by

1 P. R. O. Shaftesbury papers. 30/24/21/148. Letter endorsed 20 Feb. 1707/8.

2 Ibid.

making them wise to do them service." ³ Despite these hopes and predictions Harley, and to some extent St. John, had to serve a virtual apprenticeship before he had persuaded Tories like William Bromley to forget his part in frustrating the tack in 1704 and splitting the party. So the rest of the session saw the high-Tory leaders co-operating with Harley, but on an equal footing. They combined in attacking the ministry's management in Spain, and then they worked together over the Church bill. The latter measure was concerned with the statutes of divers cathedral and collegiate churches. It was inspired by a dispute between William Nicolson, bishop of Carlisle, and his high-Church dean, Francis Atterbury. The bishop claimed that he was the local visitor of his chapter, but Atterbury insisted that only the Queen could act as visitor. The dispute had begun in 1704, but reached a head when Nicolson held a visitation in September 1707. Atterbury was absent at the time, but when one of the prebendaries, Dr. Todd, protested, he first suspended and then excommunicated this supporter of Atterbury. Dr. Todd began appealing through the ecclesiastical courts ⁴ and Bishop Nicolson appealed to his political friends to support a bill which would uphold his claim. The dispute thus became an issue between the bishops and the high-Church clergy,

3 H. M. C., Portland Mss., iv, 478. Letter dated 27 Feb. 1707/8.

4 Atterbury himself appealed to some of the bishops for support, notably the archbishop of York and the bishops of London, Rochester, Bath and Wells, St. Asaph, and Winchester, who were all Tories. Letters to and from William Nicolson, ed. John Nichols (London, 1809), ii, 372-73. Nicolson to Bishop Trelawny, 6 Feb. 1707/8.

and between the Whigs and the Tories. The bishop was encouraged by the Whig peers, Somers, Sunderland, and Halifax.⁵ A bill was introduced and passed through the Lords⁶ without trouble, but in the Commons it became a party issue. On 28 February Harley, Harcourt, and John Sharp, son of the archbishop of York, opposed the bill.⁷ Four days later it was St. John who was leading the case for Atterbury and Todd, but he was overruled.⁸ On 9 March the bill was in committee, where two amendments, supported by St. John, Harley, Bromley, John Sharp, and Sir Thomas Powis, were defeated and the bill passed.⁹

Just when the Tories appeared reasonably united in the Commons their cause suffered two blows from without. In the first instance the Whigs sought to convict Harley of negligence, or worse, in the case of his clerk, Greg. This clerk had worked in Harley's office and had been able to correspond with the French Court by using letters sent thither by Marshal Tallard, a prisoner in Nottingham. Harley's supervision had clearly been

5 'Bishop Nicolson's Diaries', Transactions of the Cumb[erland and West[morland] Ant[iquarian and] Arch[aeological] Soc[iety] (1904), iv, 17.

6 Lords' Journals, xviii, 463 and 478. 14 and 24 Feb. 1707/8.

7 'Bishop Nicolson's Diaries', Trans. Cumb. West. Ant. Arch. Soc. (1904), iv, 25.

8 Ibid., iv, 26.

9 Ibid., iv, 27. Joseph Addison told the duke of Manchester that the bill had been supported by Spencer Cowper, Sir Joseph Jekyll, Peter King, Sir James Montagu, and Sir Thomas Parker, while the opposition was led by St. John, Harley, Harcourt, Bromley and Sir Thomas Harmer. Letters of Addison, ed. W. Graham, p. 96. Letter dated 2 Mar. 1707/8.

lax, but the seven Whig lords,¹⁰ chosen on 9 February to examine into the affair, clearly hoped to taint Harley with Jacobite intrigues.

Fortunately for the former secretary of state Greg had the courage and integrity to refuse the temptation to implicate his former master. When he was executed on 28 April 1708 he was still protesting Harley's complete¹¹ innocence. Nevertheless, Harley's reputation and the Tory cause suffered from the inquiry especially as it coincided with a threatened Jacobite invasion. In March 1708 the Pretender sailed for Scotland with French troops. Both parties declared their loyalty to the Queen. Indeed "the Tories were the first that proposed an address to be presented to her majesty assuring her we wou'd stand by her with our Lives &c. In short¹² this address was unanimously made in very high & pathetick terms."

Nonetheless, the loyalty of the Whigs to the Hanoverian succession was beyond question, but the Tories' equivocal position in relation to the Pretender's claims was bound to arouse suspicions at this critical juncture. The invasion attempt was thwarted by the navy, but the Whigs kept up the scare of Jacobite intrigues in order to influence the result of the forthcoming general election.

Parliament was dissolved on 15 April 1708 and both parties prepared for the elections which might place one or other in a commanding

¹⁰ Lords' Journals, xviii, 453. The seven Whig peers were Bolton, Devonshire, Halifax, Somers, Somerset, Townshend, and Wharton.

¹¹ G. M. Trevelyan, England under Queen Anne, ii, 331-32.

¹² Scottish Record Office. Clerk of Penicuik papers. GD 18.3140.
John Clerk to Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, London, 4 Mar. 1708.

position vis à vis the Court. The Whigs saw their opportunity to take the offensive. There were several important factors in their favour and they had much the best of the propaganda campaign prior to the elections. The war was going well and remained popular, while peace seemed but a campaign away. More important, the Whigs could challenge the Tories on their weakest front, their attitude towards the Pretender and the succession. A list of M.P.s, who had voted for and against the Lords' amendments to the abjuration oath in 1703, was published to blacklist the Tories as opponents of the Hanoverian succession.¹³ The late Jacobite invasion attempt provided the Whigs with excellent ammunition. One pamphlet claimed that the Tories would never make any inquiry into this affair for fear of exposing some of their friends: "Their Principles have a natural Tendency to favour such an Attempt, and it be certain that some of their Party were actually engag'd in it; I should think this Consideration alone sufficient at this time to determine the Choice of all the honest Freeholders in Great Britain."¹⁴ This pamphlet evidently had some effect for Ralph Bridges was soon telling Sir William Trumbull:

13 Henry St. John, of course, was one of the Tories on this list.
Supra, p. 235.

14 Advice to the Electors of Great Britain; occasioned by the intended Invasion from France (London, 1708), p. 3. A preliminary draft of this pamphlet, in the duchess of Marlborough's hand, is at Blenheim Palace, Marlborough papers, B. I-23. The duchess may have collaborated with Arthur Maynwaring in writing it, though it was also attributed to Lord Somers.

"I must be very cautious I find now of speaking or thinking favourably of the poor T—ys, if the maxims of a certain Paper, I lately met wth, are to take place. 'Tis call'd Advice to ye Electors of Great Brittain & if my intelligence is true, is wrote by my Id S—rs or some eminent member of ye Kitkat. But I am sure Defoe never wrote a more scurrilous Pamphlett; for it excuses ye Papists and Non jurors as inconsiderable, the W—gs as not to be suspected, and lays ye whole blame of the late invasion at ye poor T—ys door; and what is more cutting 15 than all, makes her Maj[es]ty's Speech mean the same thing."

The Tories could only reply with their old assertion that they were the only defendants of the Church of England, but in this election this was not a
16 potent issue. Furthermore, the Tories were still not sufficiently united

to face the Whig challenge in the general election. Arthur Maynwaring tried to explain the inactivity of the Tories in the election campaign:

"The natural reason seems to be their being broken in their fortunes, & hopeless of succeeding in the projects which are recommended to them by men that they do not believe. For your Grace may be assured that there is not a word said to them by their new Allies, Mr. Harley, St. John, & even
17 Mr. Churchill, that they have more faith in, than your Grace would have."

With public opinion more in their favour than at any time during the reign the Whigs hoped to persuade the Court to declare itself in their favour. Marlborough and Godolphin also sought to wring some minor

15 H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 858. Letter dated Fulham, 12 May 1708.

This has been checked with the original in Berkshire Record Office.

16 Prussian Mss. 33 B, f. 189. Bonet's dispatch to the Prussian Court, London, 27 April/8 May 1708.

17 Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. E 28. To the duchess of Marlborough, no date, but clearly 1708.

concessions from the Queen to let the electors see that she supported the Whigs. The case was summed up by Marlborough in a blunt letter to Queen Anne, when he urged her not to believe the insinuations of Harley.¹⁸

Though Bonet, the Prussian resident, claimed the Court favoured the Whigs in the elections¹⁹ there were few signs of this. However, the new privy council of May 1708 did include a strong band of Whigs, notably Bradford, Cowper, Derby, Devonshire, Newcastle, Sunderland, James Vernon, and Thomas Erle, and only a handful of second rank Tories like Dartmouth, Ormond, and Sir Charles Hedges.²⁰ The Whig electoral machine²¹ was not willing to

wait quietly for the small crumbs from the royal table. The Junto made it clear that they considered themselves the leaders of the party upholding the national interest, especially as in England the Whigs achieved their greatest success of the reign.²² Sunderland was exuberant, but his confidence was not entirely justified. The Tory Lord Weymouth was at first quite optimistic about his own party's chances. "All ye talke is about Elections," he wrote to Dr. Charlett, "wherein wee doe not loose ground, though all arts are employed." When most of the results were known he was not too despondent: "Our Elections are now pretty well over, & if other

18 Ibid. E 2. Letter dated Gand, 9 May 1708.

19 Prussian Mss. 33 B, f. 189 v. To the Berlin Court, London, 27 April/8 May 1708.

20 Lords' Debates, ii, 244-45.

21 According to Bonet the Whigs had the better managers and the greater funds. Prussian Mss. 33 B, f. 189 v. To the Berlin Court, London, 27 April/8 May 1708.

22 B.M. Lansdowne Ms. 1236, f. 243. Sunderland to Newcastle, Whitehall, 27 May 1708.

countries have not done worse, than this & Somersetshire, we shall not be
soe much overrun as was threatened." ²³ In the event the Whigs achieved
their only majority of the reign, but their advantage was only in the
²⁴ region of fifty seats.

It was not so much the loss of thirty seats which shocked many
Tories as the failure of Henry St. John to secure his re-election for
Wootton Bassett. ²⁵ This was caused by a rift between him and his father.
There were two likely causes of this breach. Henry St. John had ambitions
to play the great country gentleman, but, as long as his father lived, he
could not lay claim to the family estates in Wiltshire or to the property
at Battersea. His wife's property was also encumbered by the marriage
settlement, leaving St. John to some extent dependent on his spouse.
Another cause of friction was the political principles of his father, who
²⁶ was apparently a Whig though not active in politics. In April 1708

-
- 23 Bodleian Library. Ballard Ms. 10, ff. 73-74. Letters dated Longleat, 15 May and 4 June 1708.
- 24 Several estimates agree on a majority of around 50. See Prussian Mss. 33 A, f. 232. Spanheim to the Prussian Court, 8/19 June 1708; Scottish Record Office. Montrose Mss., box 1, letter C. A. Cunningham to the duke of Montrose, 20 May 1708; and Blenheim Palace, Marlborough papers, BI-2. Robert Walpole to Marlborough, Whitehall, 28 May 1708.
- 25 Two recent works, Jeffrey Hart, Viscount Bolingbroke, Tory Humanist, p. 33, and Sydney Wayne Jackman, Man of Mercury, p. 25, claim that St. John voluntarily retired. Yet this theory was exploded at least as early as 1937 by Sir Charles Petrie, Bolingbroke, pp. 104-6. Hart used Petrie a great deal and Jackman even has a foreword by Sir Charles!
- 26 See the duc d'Aumont's report to Paris, 10 Aug. 1712, in which he stated that the father was a Whig and had little correspondence with his son. Cited by Felix Salomon, Geschichte des letzten Ministeriums Königin Annas von England, p. 356.

James Brydges told Cadogan: "Our friend Mr. St. John will hardly I beleeve be in Parl[iament], his Father designing to stand at ye place he hop'd to have been chose for, & hath wrote him word that he suppos'd he would have that duty for him as not to oppose his coming in." ²⁷ St. John's father may, as Horace Walpole claimed, merely have been put out that his son had seen fit to resign his post as secretary at war rather than serve with the Whigs. ²⁸ The seat was taken by Robert Cecil, a son of the third earl of Salisbury and a Whig. ²⁹ St. John's father appears to have contested the seat, for his son told Harley: "My father makes a scandalous figure, neglected by all the gentlemen, and sure of miscarrying where his family always were revered." ³⁰ To make matters more confused the other seat was retained by Francis Popham, who was a nephew of Harley and who was regarded as a St. John nominee. ³¹ This seat could clearly have been won by St. John himself, so it appears that he obeyed his father's command not to stand for Wootton Bassett. Ironically, his father failed to win one of the seats, though his influence must have assisted Robert Cecil.

27 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, ii, f. 27.
Letter dated 11 April 1708.

28 H. Walpole to James Stanhope, 30 April 1708. Cited by Earl Stanhope, The Reign of Queen Anne (4th ed., London, 1872), ii, 174 n.

29 Cecil voted for the general naturalization act in 1709 and for the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell in 1710.

30 H. M. C., Bath Mss., i, 190. Henry St. John to Robert Harley, Bucklebury, 1 May 1708.

31 He certainly voted Tory in 1710, over the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell.

St. John was compelled to search, cap in hand, for another seat. Despite his youth he had made a reputation both in office and on the backbenches, but he was handicapped by having to begin his search only a month before the elections. Most candidates had been making interest long before this. At the beginning of May he told Harley that there was little point in standing at Cricklade, where two candidates had already engaged all but fifty of the votes. Westbury was suggested to him, but he did not think that he could obtain the support of Lord Arlington, the patron of the borough. He concluded: "I neither have omitted, nor would omit, any trouble, care or expense in my power since my friends think I might be of some little use to them and to my country, but know not which way to turn myself."³² His friends were all engaged to assist him to find a seat. George Granville tried unsuccessfully to nominate him for a Cornish borough, but had to confess his failure to Harley: "Our friend Harry [St. John], he seemed pretty confident of succeeding in some place or other, and I own I took it for granted he knew himself secure. I join with you in being under the greatest concern for this disappointment."³³ Harcourt mentioned to Harley that Lord Weymouth's son had been chosen in two places and so his lordship could probably secure one of the seats for St. John. He concluded: "I take it for granted that you have written to Lord Weymouth on this subject or speedily will."³⁴ Harley had needed no urging.

32 H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 190. To Robert Harley, Bucklebury, 1 May 1708.

33 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 489. Letter dated Treblethick, 20 May 1708.

34 Ibid., iv, 491. Letter dated 28 May 1708.

The day before he had written to Robert Price: "I suppose Ld. Weymouth depends upon keeping Weobly for his son & so can bring in another at Weymouth. I heartily wish yu wd recommend Mr. St. John to him for it."³⁵ His lordship's son, Henry Thynne, decided to sit for Weymouth, and Weobley remained vacant until December 1708. While Harley sought Lord Weymouth's support for St. John, William Bromley urged the claims of Charles Caesar, a former tacker.³⁶ In December 1708 Edward Harley reported: "Mr. Caesar was sent down by my Lord Weymouth. He refused to send down Mr. St. John: he was very much solicited to do it. I hope he will lose his interest by it, and that Mr. Gorges will carry it. I think his Lordship has shewn himself very weak in this affair. I should scarcely have acted as he has done in this case."³⁷ Lord Weymouth was a high-Tory, who may have preferred Caesar, a tacker, to either St. John or the advice of Harley. In the end the seat was won by Henry Gorges, another tacker. When, in January 1709, Weymouth was contested again, on the death of Henry Thynne, it was a Whig, Edward Clavell, who was elected.

It is evident that Harley wished to bring St. John into the Commons yet it seems that St. John held him responsible for his failure to gain re-election. St. John explained his viewpoint to James Grahme:

35 B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/154/1. Letter dated Aywood, 27 May 1708.

36 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 515. Harcourt to Harley, 28 May 1708.

37 Ibid., iv, 515. To Abigail Harley, Christchurch, 15 Dec. 1708.

"I take this event to be of very small moment to the publick, and no great misfortune to me. After I had taken the resolution of not appearing at my own Borough I did all I could to get myself elected in some other place, but found it utterly impossible, as I can satisfy you whenever we meet; tho I hear that some of our friends pretend to affirm the contrary. If I could have been of any great use, that which was impossible for me to compass in my circumstances had been brought about by those whom it is my inclination & my principle to serve and since they have left me out I conclude they do not want me.

I shall now have three years to live to myself which is a blessing I never yet enjoyed, and if I live to another Parliament, I will be elected without an obligation to anybody but the people who choose."³⁸

St. John did not do Harley justice, but their relationship never recovered its former intimacy. Never again was Harley 'master' or St. John 'faithful Harry'. When he returned to parliament in 1710 St. John was no longer the disciple of Harley.³⁹

St. John remained out of the Commons for the full term of this parliament. For much of these two years he lived on his estate at Bucklebury, Berkshire, where he enjoyed the rural pursuits of the country

38 Levens Hall Mss. Box D, file S. To Grahme, 18 July 1708. An abbreviated version of this letter was published in H.M.C., Tenth Report, Bagot Mss., p. 341.

39 In 'The attempt to assassinate Harley, 1711', History Today (1965), xv, 788-95, I argued that the breach between Harley and St. John occurred in early 1711. I would now date the end of their very close friendship as May 1708. In 1709 there were even rumours that St. John had been asked to desert his friends, but he had refused. National Library of Wales. Penrice and Margam papers. L. 648.
— to —, 30 Sept. 1709.

squire and re-established his contact with grass-roots Toryism. He expressed himself content with his rural retreat. To James Brydges he wrote: "No Man Loves You better, or can taste more Satisfaction in Your Conversation, and could I Enjoy you & a very few more friends as frequently at this Place as it is Easy [to] do in London, I wd not only make people believe I intended to Spend the rem[ainde]⁴⁰r of my days here but I would steadily resolve to do so." A short time afterwards Sir William Trumbull learned: "Mr. St. John is as errant a country gentleman as he was in the late King's time, and which is much better is like to grow honest again for he had the D[ean] of C[hrist] Church and some of the Oxford Grandees at his country seat."⁴¹ Even a year later St. John could write to Harley: "In three weeks time I intend to go to Lavington, my hounds and horses are already there, my books will soon follow. In that retreat if I may hear sometimes that you and the few friends which I have⁴² in the world are well, all will be well with me."

Though St. John could and did enjoy the life of a country gentleman there is a strong element of affectation in his frequent declarations of love for his round of rural pleasures. His active temperament and unlimited ambition soon betrayed themselves. In December

⁴⁰ 'Letters of Henry St. John to James Brydges', ed. Godfrey Davies and Marion Tinling. Huntington Library Bulletin (Oct. 1935), no. 8, p. 159. Letter dated Bucklebury, 29 July 1708.
⁴¹ H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, 11, 862. From Ralph Bridges, Fulham, 24 Oct. 1708.
⁴² H.M.C., Bath Mss., 1, 196. Letter dated Bucklebury, 17 Sept. 1709.

1708 he had hoped to secure a seat at Weobley and in the same month he mentioned to Harcourt that there might be a chance of securing election at Milborne Port for two hundred pounds, though he pretended indifference.

"I will make no reflexions upon this intelligence, but leave the fact with you. It is in my opinion of very small importance whether I am in

parliament or not, but I would leave nothing undone which my friends seem to expect from me."⁴³

By this time the Whigs had established their mastery in the Commons and were showing a partisan spirit in deciding election petitions. One of those to suffer was Harcourt himself. In January 1709 he was turned out of his seat at Abingdon and this made him unsure how he should advise St. John. He wrote to Harley for advice:

"I am unalterably fixed to come no more into the House of Commons unless I am brought thither in custody. I am not wise enough to advise Harry what to do. Perhaps the triumph over me might make them easier to him, but I should be grieved to think he sat a minute at their pleasure. There will be a controversy without doubt about this election, and I must suspect there will be at least as much ground for a petition as there was at Abingdon."⁴⁴

Whatever Harley's advice to him St. John offered to support Harcourt for the seat at Milborne Port: "I expect it from your friendship that if you are to go out, care may be taken that I may not come in; for God's sake consent to be chosen at the place now intended for me and let me take my chance in another I declare to you that if you refuse me no

⁴³ H. M. C., Portland Mss., iv, 515. Letter dated 20 Dec. 1708.

⁴⁴ Ibid., iv, 515. Letter without date, but almost certainly Jan. 1709.

consideration shall prevail on me to stand."⁴⁵ Neither of them appear to have contested the seat, which was won in May 1709 by a Whig, Thomas Smith. Harcourt had to wait until early 1710 before he re-entered parliament, but St. John did not find a seat until the general election later that year.

This meant that St. John had to remain in retirement, but, even when he wrote of his contented life, his letters betrayed his hopes of a political comeback. In September 1708 he wrote to James Grahme:

"Ye character you give of ye Age and Court is so true, yt it serves as another consideration to take off ye edge of my Ambition.

After all this, it is no part of my Scheme, whenever ye Service of my country, or of any particular friend calls me forth, to sit still. I hope and promise myself yt on any such occasion I should exert some vigour and make no despicable figure. But I have done dear James with ye implicit part, and for ye future, where I have no knowledge of ye projection I will have no Share in ye execution."⁴⁶

A year later he was explaining to another old friend, Lord Orrery:

"Whether it is owing to constitution or to Philosophy I can't tell, but certain it is, that I can make myself easy in any sort of life.

Happiness, I imagine, depends much more on desiring little, than enjoying much; & perhaps the surest road to it is Indifference. If I continue in the country, the sports of the field & the pleasures of my study will take up all my thoughts, & serve to amuse me as long as I live. If any accident should call me again to the pleasure & business of London, I shall be as eager as ever I was in the pursuit of both."⁴⁷

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, iv, 517. To Harcourt, 20 Jan. 1708/9.

⁴⁶ Levens Hall Mss. Box D, file S. Letter dated 16 Sept. 1708.

⁴⁷ Bodleian Library. English Mss. Misc. E. 180, ff. 6-7. Letter dated Bucklebury, 1 Sept. 1709.

These letters show that St. John had not given up hope of a return to office and that should he do so he would act with even more vigour and determination. They also reveal his continued interest in public affairs. While he could not remain in the forefront of the Tory party in parliament he continued to take a great interest in its fortunes. Moreover, from his retreat, he could detect the drift of public opinion in the country at large. While St. John had to remain on the side-lines the changing circumstances and fortunes of the Tory party were to a large extent shaping his political future for him. For this reason, and for an understanding of his conduct when he returned to parliament, it is necessary to follow the fortunes of the Tory party in the 1708-10 parliament.

The general election of 1708 had given the Whigs a majority, but they had still not assumed control of the levers of power. The Queen, predisposed to the Tories, continued to resist the Junto's entry into the cabinet. Godolphin hoped the election results would change the Queen's mind.⁴⁸ In the choice of a Court candidate for the Speakership, however, Godolphin himself preferred Sir Richard Onslow, a Whig who was not a follower of the Junto. The latter, thereupon, proposed putting forward Peter King⁴⁹ as a rival candidate. With the Court and the Whigs at odds the Tories

⁴⁸ B. M. Add. Ms. 9101, f. 178. To the duke of Marlborough, 11 May 1708.

⁴⁹ Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. E. 25. Arthur Maynwaring to the duchess of Marlborough, no date, but Oct.-Nov. 1708; Leicester Record Office. Finch Mss., box vi, bundle 23. William Bromley to Nottingham, 11 Nov. 1708; Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, iii, ff. 100 and 102. James Brydges to William Cadogan, 29 Oct., and to Mr. Drummond, 2 Nov. 1708.

could hope to reap advantage. Alexander Cunningham told the duke of Montrose of his fears:

"People now begin to talk of a Speaker, some are for Sir Rich. Onslow, others for Mr. King, by which competition you see the Whigs will be divided. The Torys will joyn for the latter, and the Court has not yet declared their inclinations, but interest is making on both sides. The Toreys do not yet talk of setting up any of their own, and truelie I fancie they will not pretend to any at this time, least the Whigs should unite among themselves."⁵⁰

The Tories were not sufficiently united to take full advantage of the opportunity. The Harleyite Tories had co-operated with the main body of the Tories, led by Bromley and Hammer, at the end of the 1707-8 session, but the latter did not immediately accept the former Tory renegades on an equal footing. It was not an easy task to absorb these eminent political figures nor to adjust to Harley's brand of Toryism. The process would mean changes in both leadership and tactics. Before the session opened both sides were engaged in delicate negotiations. Harley appears to have made the first approaches to Bromley in the summer of 1708, but the latter did not react with immediate enthusiasm. He told James Grahme that Harley "continues very mysterious & unintelligible."⁵¹ He certainly heard from Harley in August when he replied rather cautiously. The Queen, wrote Bromley, was besieged by the Whigs "who are

50 Scottish Record Office. Montrose Mss., box 1, letter C, dated London, July 1708. These papers have been returned to Auchmar House.
51 Levens Hall Mss. Box B, file B 2. Letter dated 15 June 1708.

ye smaller part of the Nation," but who "have taken advantage of ye mistakes of others." The obvious remedy was to unite the Tories, who formed the greater part of the nation, but Bromley was not willing to rush into Harley's arms without some clear agreement on policy:

"I can assure yu Sr, that those who yu convers'd wth last Winter are resolved most heartily to enter into measures wth you and these other Gentlemen; & I make no question but you will find a very great body to joyn upon such Publick Points as you shall agree to bring on ye Stage but they must be such as are of consequence in themselves & will appear to ye Nation & will comprehend the opinions & so consequently the assistance of ye most People to support them. This description will easily suggest to you wt these things are, & therefore I will not at present say any more upon that subject."52

Bromley was clearly not yet convinced of Harley's conversion to pure Tory principles. A month later he was still critical of Harley's former conduct and chided him for being responsible for the existing Tory divisions. Though he agreed with Harley on the need to co-operate he was still waiting to know precisely what policies Harley was prepared to pursue: "You must allow me to say this description [of the need to unite] is very general, and that I wish you had pleased to have been something more particular, for we must expect them from you, who have had opportunities by being conversant in business to know them, and are best able to direct."53

52 B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/128/3. Letter to Harley, 20 Aug. 1708.

53 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 505. To Robert Harley, 18 Sept. 1708.

Harley was disturbed by this suspicious reaction, but he was far too great a political manager to be put off the task. After receiving Bromley's letter in September he told William Stratford: "I have just receiv'd the favour of Mr. B[romley's] letter I see it very plainly that all arts will be us'd to stir up unreasonable jealousies, or by any means to keep good friends from a right understanding with one another; nothing shall be wanting on my part to obviate their wicked purposes." ⁵⁴ Two weeks later he was writing to Stratford: "I am persuaded yt after what I've said & wrote to our friend Mr. B[romley] there can remain no room for doubt but yt I will most readily & heartily espouse his interest, & particularly upon ys occasion ⁵⁵ I will do my utmost to shew him ye regard I have for his person." Henry St. John, though he could not take any part in the result of such a union in the Commons, nevertheless urged Harley to accomplish this task. He knew that without such a union he and the Harleyites would be left as a splinter group, functioning neither with the Court nor with the two major parties. The only haven left to them was the Tory party. St. John advised Harley to steer resolutely in this direction:

"There is no hope I am fully convinced but in the Church of England party, nor in that neither on the foot it now stands, and without more confidence than is yet re-established between them and us. Why do you not gain Bromley entirely? The task is not difficult, and by governing him without seeming to do so, you will influence

54 B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/171/2. Letter dated 26 Sept. 1708.

55 Ibid. Letter dated 10 Oct. 1708.

them You broke the party, unite it again, their sufferings have made them wise, and whatever piques or jealousies they may entertain at present, as they feel the success of better conduct these will wear off, and you will have it in your power by reasonable measures to lead them to reasonable ends."56

This is a particularly valuable statement of St. John's attitude at this juncture. He was anxious to ally with the high Tories, but he was not advocating the adoption of high Tory policies. His approval of Harley's endeavours to preach moderation to the Tories was still in evidence. Though generally labelled as a Tory extremist St. John had spent many years supporting Harley's strategy. Of course, when he felt that it was in his own interests, and to the advantage of the Tory party as a whole, he could adopt extreme policies. Nonetheless, it is important to see that in this instance he had not reverted to his high Tory position. This view is reinforced by another letter he wrote to Harley on the question of allying with Bromley: "It is impossible either that you should be safe from daily insults, or that the least progress should be made towards those which you purpose, unless a number of gentlemen be satisfied of their danger, unless they can be convinced that to preserve themselves they must follow you, The fiery trial of affliction has made the gentlemen of the Church of England more prepared to form such a party than from their former conduct it might have been expected."57 These letters to Harley also show that St. John no longer adopted a subservient tone, but spoke in an insistent voice that he expected to be heard.

56 H.M.C., Bath Mss., 1, 191-92. Letter dated Oct. 1708.

57 Ibid., p. 193. To Robert Harley, 6 Nov. 1708.

The divisions in the Tory ranks resulted in several candidates⁵⁸ being suggested for the Speakership. Harley, Harcourt, Bromley, and⁵⁹ Sir Thomas Hanmer were all spoken of as suitable Tory candidates. In an effort to heal the breach with Bromley, Harley offered to support his candidacy. This apparently pleased Bromley for on 12 October he was showing signs of confidence in Harley: "I must repeat my former Assurances that I truly value yr Freindship, & that I will on all Occasions use my utmost Endeavours to disappoint all Arts that may be used to prevent our coming to a good understanding. Whatever you please to intrust me with when we meet you may depend I will in no manner deceive or⁶⁰ abuse ye Confidence you shall repose in me." Even Lord Nottingham, who had disliked Harley ever since he had replaced him as secretary of state⁶¹ in 1704, approved of the plan which would bring up all the Tory members for the beginning of the session, without making it clear why they were⁶² being urged to attend. The result was an impressive display of Tory organisation, which had members from as far away as Wales and Westmorland⁶³ being told to appear in town early. Yet when the session opened the Tory leaders decided not to contest the Speakership, much to the annoyance of

58 Levens Hall Mss. Box C, file L. Gilfrid Lawson to James Grahme, London, 9 Sept. 1708.

59 Boyer's Annals, vii, 251

60 B. M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/128/3.

61 Leicester Record Office. Finch Mss., box vi, bundle 23. Bromley to Nottingham, 23 Oct. 1708.

62 H. M. C., Bath Mss., 1, 193. Robert Harley to Harcourt, 16 Oct. 1708.

63 Supra, pp. 137-139.

their backbenchers.⁶⁴ The reason was not hard to find. The Whigs had been pressing all summer to have the admiralty changed, and particularly to oust George Churchill, a Tory, who had declared his loyalty to Harley.⁶⁵ The earl of Sunderland urged his Junto colleagues to hold firm, while also counselling a closer alliance with more moderate Whigs like Newcastle, Devonshire and Townshend.⁶⁶ In October 1708 Prince George died and the distraught Queen gave way to the importunities of the Whig leaders. The earl of Pembroke replaced Prince George at the admiralty and left his own two posts vacant. Lord Wharton became lord lieutenant of Ireland and Lord Somers filled his place as lord president of the council. This capitulation persuaded the Junto to withdraw their own candidate for the Speakership and to support Sir Richard Onslow, the Court choice.⁶⁷ In this situation the Tories could only face defeat so they preferred not to put the issue to the test. Onslow was chosen nomine contradicente.⁶⁸

The Whigs now appeared firmly entrenched in power, both at Court

64 "I believe ye Gentlemen will be better informed of an opposition, before they will venture such another journey. Where the fault lies I am not a judge, but am satisfied we have bin made fools of." Bodleian Library. Top Ms. Oxon., b. 82, f. 16. Thomas Rowney to George Clarke, London, 19 Nov. 1708.

65 Marlborough was furious with his brother. See his important letter to George Churchill, no date, but 1708, in Blenheim Palace, Marlborough papers, E. 26.

66 B.M. Lansdowne Ms. 1236, f. 246. To the duke of Newcastle, London, 19 Oct. 1708.

67 Ibid., f. 252. Sunderland to Newcastle, London, 4 Nov. 1708; and Charborough Park. Erle papers. Robert Walpole to Thomas Erle, 15 Nov., and James Craggs to Erle, 5 Nov. 1708.

68 Commons' Journals, xvi, 4. 16 Nov. 1708.

and in parliament. For the moment the Tories could only fight a defensive campaign. This task was made more difficult by continued suspicions of Harley by the high Tories. The earl of Nottingham was the chief obstacle to harmonious relations. He accepted that Bromley should meet Harley, but only to hear what proposals the latter might make.⁶⁹ In December Bromley told Nottingham of one of these meetings and expressed renewed doubts about Harley: "He proposes schemes that if they are pursued may perhaps save a penny, but what is that when all is at stake? He certainly can lay others & give his assistance in them that are more material & serviceable, & if he will not soon do so, I think he may be justly suspected for the future."⁷⁰ Nottingham advised him not to trust Harley. In this interesting letter he also expressed a lack of confidence in one of Harley's friends:

"I believe that you are misinformed that the schemes of one eminent man are more moderate than those of another. He [Harley] is indeed in appearance more modest, humble, & affable, but he steadily prosecutes his ends, which are plain set (tho' he be very reserved) to show him to be very ambitious & implacable; the other seems more open in conversation & more active in executing projects tho' the first forms them, what difference in the parts they act may occasion that different opinion of them that the one is more moderate than the other."⁷¹

This is very probably a reference to St. John, though it could refer to Harcourt. It does show that Nottingham remained hostile to Harley and

69 Leicester Record Office. Finch Mss., box vi, bundle 23. Nottingham to Bromley (draft), 15 Nov. 1708.

70 Ibid. Bromley to Nottingham, 7 Dec. 1708.

71 Ibid. Nottingham to Bromley (draft), 20 Dec. 1708.

his friends and was hoping to keep Bromley and the Tories out of their clutches. Though he failed to prevent a growing Harley-Bromley rapprochement, Nottingham himself remained aloof. Even when Rochester came to terms with Harley in 1710, Nottingham did not follow his old colleague's lead.

The Harley-Bromley union was cemented in the 1708-9 session when they led the opposition to what was in reality a Whig government. Though in a minority the Tories gained some minor successes. After Marlborough's victory at Oudenarde, and with the prospect of peace negotiations, a direct attack on Marlborough or the war was out of the question. The Tories hoped to strike an indirect blow by their efforts to praise the Tory general, John Richmond Webb, who had distinguished himself against a superior French force at Wynendael on 17/28 September 1708. Unfortunately, the London Gazette at first gave the credit to Marlborough's favourite, Cadogan, though this was speedily corrected, not least by Marlborough himself.⁷² Webb was easily persuaded to feel aggrieved and his Tory friends stoked the fires of his resentment. In the new parliamentary session, 1708-9, the Tories took up his cause. On 13 December, Mr. Pitt (probably the Tory, George Pitt) introduced a motion to give Webb the thanks of the House of Commons. The move was well planned for it appears to have taken the Whigs unprepared and in a temporary minority in the House. Francis Hare complained bitterly:

72 G. M. Trevelyan, England under Queen Anne, ii, 372.

"The enemy have here scandalously surprized us, & ye Tory squadron under ye conduct of Mr. Bromley has gained as great a victory (tho' I hope not so important) against as great a superiority of numbers as ye W— Genll did in his engagement with Monsr. Lamotte. Mr. Bromley's speech was virulent to the last degree, & so horribly ungrateful at this time of day when his Grace is doing so much for us ye heads of the other side being out of ye house, ye thanks was agreed & ye reflections not answered. This is a great slur on the Whigs (tho' their heads were absent & at a meeting upon Recruits) yt they won't rest till they have their revenge."⁷³

Godolphin explained to Marlborough that the motion had been aimed at him, but, since it came as a surprise, had not been parried.⁷⁴ Marlborough's reply took notice of "Mr. Bromley's barbarous ill-natured proceeding."⁷⁵ The general was very disappointed that none of his friends had defended his name.⁷⁶ James Brydges felt constrained to apologise to Marlborough, explaining that he had arrived too late in the Commons to refute Bromley.⁷⁷ The Tories followed up this success with attacks on the government's recruiting measures and on the augmentation of the forces to strengthen the alliances with Portugal and Savoy.⁷⁸ The ministry managed to thwart this opposition and, in particular, it adopted the expedient of offering

73 B.M.Add.Ms. 33225, f. 13. To Henry Watkins, London, 14 Dec. 1708.

74 Ibid. Add.Ms. 9103, f. 153. Letter dated 14/25 Dec. 1708.

75 Ibid. Add.Ms. 9104, f. 10. To Godolphin 20/31 Dec. 1708.

76 The Wentworth Papers, ed. J. J. Cartwright, p. 69. Peter Wentworth to Lord Raby, London, 4 Jan. 1709.

77 Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. B 1-23. Brydges to Marlborough, 2 Jan. 1708/9.

78 B.M.Add.Ms. 9103, f. 153. Godolphin to Marlborough, 14/25 Dec. 1708.

any parish four pounds for each recruit raised.⁷⁹ On 12 January 1709, the Commons discussed the need to strengthen the forces in Spain⁸⁰ and the Tories, led by Bromley, Harley, and Hanmer, reflected severely on the management of the war in this theatre and accused the government of neglect.⁸¹

After the Christmas recess the Tories were mortified at the success of the election petition against Sir Simon Harcourt, who lost his Abingdon seat to a Whig, William Hucks.⁸² The verdict was most unjust and purely the result of a party vendetta. James Brydges confessed to Cadogan that the turning out of Harcourt occurred "at half an hour after two in ye morning. Ye reason I leave you to Guess, when I assure you, there was so little for it in his case that even Sr. Jos. Jekyll, ye Attorney & Sollicitor were absent, Mr. Topham & Mr. Compton with ye Vice Chamberlain, for him."⁸³ The loss of Harcourt was a severe blow, for, like the absent St. John, he was one of the great orators in the Commons.⁸⁴

79 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, i, 128. James Brydges to Col. Hunter, 24 Dec. 1708.

80 Commons' Journals, xvi, 57.

81 Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. BI-23. Robert Walpole to Marlborough, 14 Jan. 1709.

82 Commons' Journals, xvi, 65. The voting was 186 to 138, with Sir John Stonehouse and Annesley acting as tellers for the minority and Robert Walpole and Lord William Pawlett for the majority.

83 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, i, f. 153. Letter dated 28 Jan. 1708/9. There were also rumours that the Whigs planned to oust Robert Harley, though this came to nothing. H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 870. Thomas Butler to Sir William Trumbull, 4 Feb. 1708/9.

84 Prussian Mss. 34 B, f. 22. Bonet to the Prussian Court, London, 21 Jan./1 Feb. 1709. Bonet also added that Robert Harley was a poor speaker.

Yet it did not prevent the Tories continuing as a thorn in the side of the triumphant Whigs. They bungled an attack on the ministry over its handling of the Jacobite invasion attempt in 1708, but succeeded in scaring the government when it planned to amend the treason law in Scotland. From mid-January 1709 Henry Boyle, secretary of state, began laying before the House numerous papers concerning the Jacobite expedition of 1708. For some time little notice was taken of them,⁸⁵ but then, on 10 March, the Tories planned to attack the government's preparations to meet the Jacobite threat, and, in particular, to criticise Marlborough for not sending sufficient forces from Flanders. The plan went completely awry. With some satisfaction, and even more irritation, Francis Hare told Henry Watkins: "Yr old friends the T[ories] continue as silly as ever & shewed their teeth on Thursday last [10 March], tho' they had neither agreed their measures nor settled a question: one would think they took pains to loose [sic] the little Interest they are supposed to have in his Grace."⁸⁶ The Whigs were able to counter with a motion expressing entire satisfaction with the measures taken by the government. This was passed by the large majority of 186 to 76 votes.⁸⁷ Despite this set-back the Tories took

85 Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. BI-22a. Henry Boyle to Marlborough, Whitehall, 1 Feb. 1708/9.

86 B.M.Add.Ms. 33225, f. 19. Letter dated Duke Street, 15 March 1708/9.

87 Commons' Journals, xvi, 150. 10 Mar. 1709. The tellers were Spencer Compton and Robert Walpole for the Whigs, and Annesley and Hanmer for the Tories. On 12 March the Commons voted 164-86 to print the papers relating to the invasion attempt. The tellers for the minority were Sir Godfrey Copley and Ralph Freeman. Ibid., xvi, 153.

immediate advantage of the annoyance of the Scottish members with the Whigs' attempts to tamper with the treason law of Scotland.⁸⁸ It was decided to bring in a bill to render the Union more complete. This laid down that Scotland was to accept the same laws governing high treason as pertained in England: only those crimes that constituted high treason in England were in future to be crimes of high treason in Scotland, and the manner of proceeding and the penalties were to be the same in both countries.⁸⁹ Even though the Court had recently rewarded some Scottish peers,⁹⁰ the Scots regarded this bill as a dangerous infringement of the 18th and 19th articles of the Act of Union, which expressly stated that the laws and judicial system in Scotland should remain inviolable. With the Scots rebelling against the ministry the Tories had an excellent opportunity to fish in these troubled waters.

When the bill came first before the Lords all the Scots, even Bishop Burnet, united in opposition to it. The debates were very acrimonious especially when the Scots and the Tories tried to amend the bill to give the accused a list of the prosecution witnesses at least five days before the trial. This clause, offered by the Tory, Lord Guilford,

88 The ministry was dissatisfied with the working of the Scottish law of treason, which seemed to have allowed some Scottish Jacobites to secure an acquittal in Edinburgh. See H.M.C., House of Lords Mss., 1708-10, viii, passim.

89 Lords' Journals, xviii, 661.

90 In February 1709 Queensberry had become a third secretary of state, for Scottish affairs, the duke of Montrose had been made lord privy seal for Scotland, and Roxburgh had been sworn to the privy council.

was defeated by 40 to 25 votes,⁹¹ with all except one of the latter registering a protest.⁹² When the bill passed its third reading by 45 to 22 votes,⁹³ twenty Scots and Tories signed a protest.⁹⁴ In the Commons the opposition was, if anything, even fiercer. Horace Walpole claimed that "the Tories had no consideration but to oblige so great a body as the Scotch."⁹⁵ This alliance came close to wrecking the treason bill on its very first reading. The vote, on 29 March, was 116 to 108, with Lord Archibald Hamilton and the Tory, Sir Thomas Mansell, acting as the tellers for the minority.⁹⁶ Two days later the vote to commit the bill was again very close, 149 to 141 votes, with the tellers for the minority, Colonel Alexander Grant and Robert Benson,⁹⁷ again reflecting the

91 Carlisle Public Library. Bishop Nicolson's diary for 1709-10, 28 March 1709.

92 Lords' Journals, xviii, 689. 13 of the 16 Scottish peers signed this protest, viz., Annandale, Crawford, Hamilton, Islay, Loudoun, Mar, Montrose, Orkney, Rosebery, Rothes, Roxburgh, Seafield and Wemyss. The exceptions were Glasgow, Leven, and Northesk. Three other Scotsmen joined in the protest, namely, Bishop Burnet, Argyll (as earl of Greenwich), and Queensberry (as duke of Dover). Six Tories, Buckingham, Denbigh, Guilford, Peterborough, Poulett, and Scarsdale, joined them, but only two Whigs, Scarborough and Warrington, did so.

93 Prussian Mss. 34 B, f. 97. Bonet's dispatch of 29 Mar./9 April 1709, and B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/320. Dyer's Newsletter, 29 Mar. 1709.

94 Lords' Journals, xviii, 689. The dissenting peers were the same 16 Scotsmen, and four Tories, Buckingham, Denbigh, Guilford, and Peterborough.

95 To General Stanhope, Whitehall, 19 April 1709. Cited by Earl Stanhope, The Reign of Queen Anne, ii, 100.

96 Commons' Journals, xvi, 178.

97 Ibid., xvi, 181.

Scots-Tory alliance. In the committee there were several divisions on clauses to amend the bill. On 7 April, the opposition secured two vital amendments; the estates of a convicted traitor, though forfeited, were to pass to his heirs, and the accused was to be given a list of prosecution witnesses ten days before his trial. ⁹⁸ The amended bill was then passed by the handsome majority of 141 to 75 votes. ⁹⁹ A week later, the Lords took these amendments into consideration. The peers agreed to them, ¹⁰⁰ provided they did not take place until after the death of the Pretender.

The session was now nearly over and the opposition to the bill in the Commons tried to defer considering the Lords' amendments for three weeks, hoping the bill would be lost when parliament was prorogued. However, on 15 April, it was carried by 119 to 114 votes to consider the amendments on the 18th. ¹⁰¹ In preparation for this debate Robert Harley

98 Iuttrell, vi, 427. Bonet, the Prussian resident, claimed that the Court conceded these amendments to satisfy the Scots. Prussian Mss. 34 B, f. 114. Dispatch to Berlin, dated London, 8/19 April 1709.

99 Commons' Journals, xvi, 193. 8 April 1709. The tellers for the majority were Col. Alexander Grant and John Aislable. The latter was of doubtful party allegiance, though he voted in favour of Dr. Sacheverell in 1710.

100 Christ Church Library, Oxford. Wake Mss., vol. 17, no. 204. Edmund Gibson to Bishop Wake, Lambeth, 14 April 1709. Bishop Nicolson told Bishop Wake that all the Scots opposed both amendments. Ibid. Dated Westminster, 14 April 1709. See also Bonet's long dispatch, London, 15/26 April 1709, in Prussian Mss., 34 B, ff. 122-23.

101 Commons' Journals, xvi, 202.

"took a great deal of pains", but the Court "assembled all their forces,
the lame and blind and all, and yet it was carried but by six." ¹⁰² Peter

Wentworth informed his brother:

"The Tories, some of the old Whigs, and all the Scots, are mighty angry to have been outvoted in the passing the clause that came down as an amendment from the house of Lords in the Treason Bill, as losers they take the liberty to speak very freely 'Twas carried by six, and they say they can name above that number who had they been left to their liberty wou'd have been with them, but they were dragoon [sic] into 't, and sent positively word that if they did not vote as desir'd they shou'd be turn'd out of their places." ¹⁰³

By 152 to 146 votes it was agreed that the amendments made by the Commons ¹⁰⁴
should not take place on 1 July 1709. In a last-ditch stand the

opposition sought to secure an adjournment, but the motion was defeated by ¹⁰⁵ ¹⁰⁶
156 to 141 votes.

The Scots then left the House in a rage and it was agreed without a division that the original amendments of the Commons ¹⁰⁷
should come into force three years after the Hanoverian succession. ¹⁰⁸

Next day the Lords unanimously accepted this alteration.

102 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 523. Abigail Harley to her aunt, London, 19 April 1709.

103 The Wentworth Papers, ed. J. J. Cartwright, p. 83. To Lord Raby, 22 April 1709.

104 Commons' Journals, xvi, 205. The tellers for the minority were Col. Grant and John Aislachie.

105 Ibid. The tellers for the minority were Lord Archibald Hamilton and Thomas Sharp, a Tory.

106 Horace Walpole to General Stanhope, Whitehall, 19 April 1709. Cited by Earl Stanhope, The Reign of Queen Anne, ii, 100.

107 Commons' Journals, xvi, 205.

108 Lords' Journals, xviii, 714. The act is in Statutes of the Realm, ix, 93-5.

The Tories, with powerful Scottish support, had given the ministry its greatest fright of the session. They clearly hoped they could keep their Scottish allies for the next session,¹⁰⁹ but these expectations were not realised.¹¹⁰ In the other clashes in 1709 the Tories were less successful. In February Annesley had led an abortive attack upon Godolphin's handling of the accounts¹¹¹ and when, on the 26th, the Tories tried to prevent an address to the Queen for more effectual care to be taken to prevent arrears in the land tax, they were swamped by 237 to 99 votes.¹¹² Ironically, one of the measures which the Tories tried, and signally failed, to defeat was later to bring them considerable public support. This was the General Naturalization Act. This bill passed its third reading in the Commons, on 7 March 1709, by the overwhelming majority of 203 to 77 votes,¹¹³ and was rushed through the

109 H. M. C., Portland Mss., iv, 523. Abigail Harley to her aunt, London, 19 April 1709.

110 George Lockhart, The Lockhart Papers (London, 1817), i, 301. The Court tried to mollify the Scots by passing a general act of grace, pardoning all treasons committed before 19 April 1709, except those at sea. Parliamentary History, vi, 793.

111 The Wentworth Papers, pp. 77-78. Peter Wentworth to Lord Raby, 1 March 1709.

112 Commons' Journals, xvi, 126. The tellers for the minority were Hammer and Bromley.

113 Commons' Journals, xvi, 143. For an analysis of the voting on this bill, see supra, p. 83, n. 150, and my paper, 'The Tory party's attitude to foreigners: a note on party principles in the age of Anne', to be published in Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. in Nov. 1967.

114
Lords in one day. Within weeks of the passing of this act thousands of poor Palatines began to enter the country. This rapid influx of destitute foreigners caused a chronic problem and aroused the fears of the London mob and many a corporation which was asked to provide for them. The Tories refused to help in the task of settling the poor Palatines and laid all the blame for the crisis squarely on the shoulders of the Whigs. The problem exercised the public and popular mind throughout the summer of 1709, and, indeed, long after. In these months it was to reap the Tories 115 considerable, if undeserved, political capital.

The Palatine affair was a source of embarrassment to the Whigs, but it was almost insignificant compared to two other disasters which befell the ministry; the failure to make peace and the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell. After the victory at Oudenarde and the terrible winter 116 of 1708-9 it was confidently forecast that peace would be made in 1709. Peace negotiations were indeed opened and by the end of May the allies had drawn up forty preliminary articles which were presented as an ultimatum to France. The 37th article required Louis XIV to give up Spain to the Austrian claimant within two months. Louis could not implement this

114 Lords' Journals, xviii, 667-8.

115 See, supra, pp. 85-86, and my article, 'The Poor Palatines and the Parties', to be published in E.H.R. (July 1967), lxxii, 464-485.

116 "All the Talk here is of Peace which is universally beleiv'd will be very speedily, and God send it may be a good One and then I hope You and all of us shall partake of its blessings." Buckinghamshire Record Office. Verney Mss. Thomas Cave to Lord Fermanagh, 16 April 1709. Both these men were Tories.

clause since his grandson, Philip V, refused to abandon Madrid, and yet the allies expected Louis to give up his frontier fortresses even before he knew whether Philip would take his advice. This, as even the Whigs¹¹⁷ recognised, would put him at the mercy of the allies. The war continued and both sides went forward to the bloody field of Malplaquet.

The war was also becoming an economic burden on all the powers, and in England it weighed most heavily on the landed classes. On all sides there were complaints. From Northumberland Sir Edward Blackett could write: "All sorts of Corn are extravagantly dear here, I have not known the like in any time. New Wheat was sold in our Markett last week¹¹⁸ at 8/6 p. bushel." Charles Bertie wrote from Uffington: "The country longs for peace, & thinks Tournay & its Citadell are a dear bargain for¹¹⁹ six millions a year; & the Dutch to reap the benefitt thereof." In a long paper in his own hand Robert Harley attacked the war. "Every year we are amas'd with chemerical Designs, in order to cover the cheats & misapplication of many; & whilst one family share amongst them the wealth of the nation ... while the poor freeholders stoops down under the heavy weight of multiplied & continued Taxes ... no wonder the Landed man is so hard press'd when our Task masters feel not the least part of it

117 H.M.C., Fourteenth Report (Hare Mss.), app. ix, p. 223. Francis Hare to George Naylor, 7 June 1709.

118 Northumberland Record Office. Blackett (Matfen) Mss. Newby Letter-book 1, ZBL, 189. Sir Edward Blackett to J. Blackett, May 1709.

119 Lincoln Record Office. Monson Mss., 7/12, letter 136. Charles Bertie to Sir John Newton, 28 Aug. 1709.

120
themselves." The complaints of the Tory landed gentry were not without foundation. Research into the economic situation of this period has revealed the truth of these assertions. The bad harvests of 1709-10 caused not only sharp increases in the price of food, but also led to a contraction in the consumption of other goods. A price and cost of living index has been compiled, which shows that, taking 1700 as 100, the scale registered 89 in 1707, 94 in 1708, 104 in 1709 and an alarming 131 in 1710. Moreover, the export of all grains slumped in the years 1710-11. The price of corn at home rose rapidly at the same time. The cost per quarter was 26/- in 1707, 37/11 in 1708, 71/11 in 1709, and 71/6 in 1710.

Henry St. John, who at Bucklebury was in close contact with the feelings of the country gentry, gave voice to their fears and demands. After the 1708 campaign he had seen the opportunity for peace and was prepared to accept the loss of Spain. When, in November 1708, he declared to Harley: "For God's sake let us be out of Spain!", he showed a better grasp of the European situation than did the allied powers a few months later. Throughout 1709 his demands for peace became more insistent. In July he wrote to Lord Orrery:

"We have now been twenty years engaged in the two most expensive wars that Europe ever saw. The whole burthen

120 B. M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/10/1. Draft dated 24 Aug. 1710.

121 A. H. John, 'War and the English Economy, 1700-63', Economic History Review, 2nd series (1955), vii, no. 3, 334-37.

122 Churchill, iv, 224 n.

123 H. M. C., Bath Mss., i, 194.

of this charge has lain upon the landed interest during the whole time. The men of estates have generally speaking, neither served in the Fleets nor armies, nor meddled in the public funds & management of the Treasure.

A new Interest has been created out of their Fortunes, & a sort of property wch was not known twenty years ago, is now encreased to be almost equal to the terra firma of our island. The consequence of all this is that the landed men are become poor & dispirited. They either abandon all thoughts of the public, turn arrant farmers, & improve the Estates they have left: or else to seek to repair their shattered fortunes by listing at court, or under the Heads of Partys. In the meanwhile those men are become their masters, who formerly would with joy have been their servants."¹²⁴

This is a classic exposition of the prejudices of the landed interest. It shows St. John putting forward the views of the Tory backwoodsmen. Yet he could also justify the need for peace on sound economic grounds. In another letter to Lord Orrery he wrote:

"Tho' the condition of France by evident tokens appears to be miserable, yet their ill Circumstances are certainly exaggerated in our accounts. I doubt we may add that our own state is not much better than our Enemy's, & that an unseasonable Harvest would reduce our People to the same misery as we triumph over.

Peace is as much our interest as theirs. I am so firmly persuaded of this, that I will continue to hope the winter may ripen this glorious fruit, wch the summer could not."¹²⁵

In a similar letter he told James Brydges: "Peace is at this time the most desireable publick or private Good. If you will not think yt I put on too much of the Country Esqr. I'll venture to tell you, that wee want it more than perhaps any man out of the Country can Imagine. Glorious Successes

¹²⁴ Bodleian Library. English Mss., misc. E. 180, ff. 4-5. Letter dated Bucklebury, 9 July 1709.

¹²⁵ Ibid., f. 7. Letter dated Bucklebury, 1 Sept. 1709.

and the hopes of a last Campaine are Sovereigne Cordials. They Elevate
the few spirits we have left and wee are not seen to pine or Languish;
but should the Distemper Continue the strings of Life may Crack at once." ¹²⁶
After the costly victory at Malplaquet, St. John congratulated
¹²⁷ Marlborough, but to Brydges he expressed the hope that "surely now wee
may hope that peace is not far off. It is onely this Consequence of Warr
¹²⁸ wch gives a true lustre to the greatest Glory in Arms." He was soon
critical of the costly victory: "The reason why we have no more
particulars of ye late Battle, is, I imagine because they would only serve
to shew how dear our victory cost us." ¹²⁹ The renewed confidence of the
French and the recruiting of reinforcements in England filled him with
despair that the war would continue for yet another campaign. ¹³⁰ Brydges,
himself, was fully convinced. He admitted to Cadogan: "I can only assure
you the little appearance there is of Peace hath reduced everything here to
such a degree not to be expresst, yt 'tis as much as the Bank are able to do
to keep their heads above water that we are almost brought to our last stake,

-
- 126 'Letters of Henry St. John to James Brydges', ed. Godfrey Davies and
Marion Tinling, Huntington Library Bulletin (Oct. 1935), no. 8, p. 161.
Letter dated Bucklebury, 26 June 1709.
- 127 The Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, ii, 387-88.
St. John to Marlborough, Bucklebury, 8 Sept. 1709.
- 128 'Letters of Henry St. John to James Brydges', ed. Godfrey Davies and
Marion Tinling, Huntington Library Bulletin (Oct. 1935), no. 8, p. 164.
Letter dated Bucklebury, 8 Sept. 1709.
- 129 Ibid., p. 165. To Brydges, Bucklebury, 15 Sept. 1709.
- 130 Ibid., pp. 165-66. To Brydges, Bucklebury, 15 Sept. and Lavington,
18 Nov. 1709.

and that let our Resolutions be never so vigorous for carrying on the warr
our circumstances are reduc'd to such a pass, and our difficulties encrease
so fast upon us, yt Peace will be as welcome to us as I hope 'tis necessary
131
for our Enemies."

The other Tory leaders were not slow to take advantage of the
prevailing mood of the country, which was disappointed at the breakdown in
the peace negotiations and shocked at the cost of victory at Malplaquet.
Bromley expressed his own fears that a good peace might have slipped through
the allies' fingers: "I am sorry to find our Expectations of a Peace likely
to vanish; the Terms, as we have them, are such, that unless the Enemy is
reduced to the last Extremity, we can never imagine will be given us. I
132
wish we may not at last be obliged to take worse than we may now have."

Harley was told that the generality of people wanted peace and advised to
show them how they might have had it: "Some opportunities have already been
lost; if more of the same nature should offer it would be for the service
of her Majesty and the public that they might not be slipped over in silence
133
as the others have been."

Godolphin, in fact, had long expected a
parliamentary attack if the peace negotiations should fail. He warned
Marlborough:

131 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, iii, f. 140.
To Cadogan, 6 Jan. 1709/10.

132 Levens Hall Mss., box B, file B 2. To James Grahme, Baginton, 3 June
1709.

133 H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 197. The duke of Shrewsbury to Harley,
Heathrop, 3 Nov. 1709.

"I wish you good success very heartily in the war, or in the peace, and I hope it will be the latter; without it all will fall to pieces here next winter. If we can get it upon the foot of the preliminary treaty, everybody of all sides would really be pleased with it. But even, in that case, Harley and his emissaries would say you might have what terms you would, as they did when they thought the preliminaries agreed to. And if it should prove in any one article, less to our advantage, they would say you might have had better, but, that you had a mind to protract the war."¹³⁴

Godolphin was not being unduly pessimistic. The Tories attacked the ministry over the extravagant terms offered to the Dutch in the Barrier Treaty of 1709.¹³⁵ In parliament the Tories began objecting to voting supplies for the war. For the first time they opposed an additional means of raising money, the window tax, and the Court only secured it by 114 to 97 votes.¹³⁶ The same happened in January 1710: "The House is very hard putt to it to find ways & means to raise the supplys. There was a Tax propos'd upon candles but that is laid aside. They are now adding to the Excise upon Beer & Ale."¹³⁷ On 15 February the Commons discussed an address requesting the Queen to hasten the duke of Marlborough's departure to Holland to assist in the renewed peace

134 The Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, ii, 356. Letter dated 4 Aug. 1709. See Marlborough's reply, 22 Aug. 1709. Ibid., ii, 373.

135 Douglas Coombs, The Conduct of the Dutch, pp. 188-212.

136 Prussian Mss. 34 B, f. 310 v. Bonet's dispatch, London, 23 Dec. 1709. There is no mention of this division in the Commons' Journals.

137 Carlisle Record Office. Lonsdale Mss. D/Lons., bundle 12. James Lowther to William Gilpin, London, 24 Jan. 1709/10.

negotiations. Robert Walpole reported the opposition made by the Tories: "Mr. Annesley, Bromley, &c. fired at this motion & treated it as if ye Duke had been or were to be laid aside Id. M's friends came zealously into ye motion, among ye rest yr humble servant took his part very freely."¹³⁸ The motion passed by 184 to 101 votes, with Annesley and Hanmer acting as tellers for the Tory opposition.¹³⁹ The failure of the new peace negotiations at Gertruydenberg in 1710 was a further disappointment to the nation and a heavy stick the Tories could use to beat the Whig ministry. In the 1710 election it was a powerful issue working to the advantage of the Tories, but by then it had been overtaken by an even more potent Tory cry, 'the Church in danger'.

The high Church clergy had often delivered sermons on the dangers facing the Church of England, without arousing the wrath of the Whigs or the ministry. Exception was taken, however, when Dr. Henry Sacheverell, ~~lecturer~~ at St. Saviour's, Southwark, preached before the lord mayor at St. Paul's on 5 November 1709.¹⁴⁰ His text, 'in perils

138 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 58, v, f. 124. Robert Walpole to James Brydges, 15 Feb. 1709/10. See Thomas Coke to Brydges, 15 Feb. 1709/10. Ibid., ff. 124-26.

139 Commons' Journals, xvi, 314. The Lords agreed to join in the address, though 12 Tory peers signed a dissenting motion, viz., Beaufort, Berkshire, Craven, Dartmouth, Denbigh, Guilford, Northampton, Nottingham, Plymouth, Rochester, Scarsdale, and Weymouth. Lords' Journals, xix, 69. 16 Feb. 1710.

140 Dr. Sacheverell had regularly preached against the Dissenters, and he had delivered a similar sermon to the grand jury of Derby on 15 August 1709. A. T. Scudi, The Sacheverell Affair (New York, 1939), pp. 19-37.

among false brethren', was an attack on the Dissenters and all their supporters.¹⁴¹ He had also referred to "the crafty Insidiousness of such wilely Volpones", which was taken to be a slur on Godolphin.¹⁴²

It was also felt that he had attacked the whole ministry and even the basis of the Revolution settlement. The ministers rashly chose to make an example of Sacheverell, particularly since the lord mayor had ordered the sermon to be published.¹⁴³ Lord Somers had opposed taking any notice of Sacheverell,¹⁴⁴ and Marlborough expressed doubts: "I've continual Sollicitations from all ye Church & ye whole body of ye Inferior clergy espouse his Interest, & seem'd to express some apprehensions of carrying things too far." Lord Wharton's reply was "Quash him & damn him."¹⁴⁵ The ministers were soon to regret their decision. It was not long before James Brydges was lamenting: "Our Bills of money are all in the house and had beene past before this time had it not beene for the Unfortunate Tryal of Sacheverell, wch will do a great Deal of hurt and I heartily wish it had never beene medled with for I am much afraid it will

141 Luttrell, vi, 508. The text was from 2 Corinthians, cap. 11, verse 26.

142 A. T. Scudi, The Sacheverell Affair, p. 63; and Ann Clavering to James Clavering, London, 26 Nov. 1709. Durham University Library. Clavering papers.

143 It caused quite a stir and Ann Clavering bought one for 2d. Ibid. To James Clavering, London, 26 Nov. 1709.

144 A. T. Scudi, The Sacheverell Affair, p. 64.

145 Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers. Trumbull Mss., vol. liv, Ralph Bridges to Sir William Trumbull, 9 Jan. 1709/10.

have the effect with our friends that the Occasional Bill formerly produced to the Tories."¹⁴⁶

On 13 and 14 December, the Commons discussed Sacheverell, resolved that his sermons at Derby and St. Paul's were 'malicious, scandalous and seditious libels', and voted to impeach him.¹⁴⁷ The move must have taken the Tories by surprise for at one time there were only 55 members in the House, and only five of these were Tories.¹⁴⁸ On the 14th, Sacheverell presented himself, desiring to say a few words in his own defence. His request was supported by Annesley, Bromley, and John Ward, but it was successfully opposed by the Whigs.¹⁴⁹ Despite this failure William Stratford was convinced the impeachment would reap political advantage to the Tories: "So solemn a prosecution for such a scribble will make the Doctor and his performance much more considerable than either of them could have been on any other account. It works more than I could have expected. He is visited and presented by clergy and

¹⁴⁶ Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, ii, f. 173. To Mr. Drummond, 7 March 1709/10. On the same day Brydges expressed to Cardonnell the hope that the trial of Sacheverell "may not prove a very unfortunate business, it hath alarm'd people more than is to be expressed and occasion'd such a ferment in the Nation that will require a good Deale of time to allay." *Ibid.*, f. 174.

¹⁴⁷ Commons' Journals, xvi, 240-42. The articles of impeachment were referred to a committee of seventeen Whigs, including stalwarts like Robert Walpole, Sir Joseph Jekyll, Sir Peter King, Nicholas Lochmero, and Lord Coningsby.

¹⁴⁸ Hearne, ii, 329. 16 Dec. 1709. The Tories were Annesley, Bromley, Oglethorpe, Whitlock and one other.

¹⁴⁹ H.M.C., Egmont Mss., ii, 243-44. Sir John Perceval to Archdeacon William Perceval, London, 16 Dec. 1709.

laity. Those whom he has used brutally, forgot their past resentments on this occasion and visit him. I hear Sir Simon Harcourt has promised to be one of his counsel."¹⁵⁰ Sacheverell's sermon had been criticised by Hoadley and so the Whigs moved to address the Queen to prefer the latter. Bromley led the unsuccessful opposition, but the resolution was received coldly by the Queen anyway.¹⁵¹ Sacheverell was taken into custody. Bromley and Wilfrid Lawson offered to meet his fees, though it has been claimed that they later refused to pay them.¹⁵²

The articles of impeachment were read in the Commons on 11 January 1710. A motion to recommit them was supported by Annesley, Bromley, and Harley,¹⁵³ who 'spoke long and well',¹⁵⁴ but it was defeated by 232 to 13 votes and the articles were engrossed.¹⁵⁵ Two days later

150 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 530. To Robert Harley, 21 Dec. 1709.

151 Ibid., p. 531.

152 Durham University Library. Clavering papers. Ann Clavering to James Clavering, 21 Jan. 1709/10.

153 Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers. Trumbull Mss., vol. liv, Ralph Bridges to Sir William Trumbull, 13 Jan. 1710.

154 B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/321. Dyer's Newsletter, 12 Jan. 1709/10.

155 Commons' Journals, xvi, 261. The tellers for the minority were Sir Thomas Mansell and John Sharp, son of the archbishop of York. There are several different lists of the members who voted for and against Dr. Sacheverell. These, however, do not inspire absolute confidence. For instance 12 members appear in one list as voting for Dr. Sacheverell, who, in other lists, are listed as voting against him. Eleven members are described as absent in one list, but they appear in others. See W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-1714: A Study in Political Organisation', Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1965), pp. 73 and 442-5. Nevertheless the lists do give a reasonable guide to those who were for and against Dr. Sacheverell. Among the former were Robert, Edward, and Thomas Harley, Edward and Thomas Foley, Harcourt, Hanmer, Bromley, Annesley, Sir Gilbert Dolben, Arthur Moore, Ralph Freeman, Sir Justinian Isham, John Ward, Charles Eversfield, and James Grahme. Both James Brydges and Thomas Coke voted against Sacheverell, as did Admiral Leake, who was regarded as a Tory.

the articles were exhibited before the Lords. Before the trial the Commons heard Sacheverell's reply to the charges, but it was judged that it did not answer the case and that he merited impeachment and punishment.¹⁵⁶ The trial opened on 27 February 1710 with the Whig managers, including Robert Walpole, Sir Joseph Jekyll, Peter King, Lord William Pawlett, and Lord Coningsby, exhibiting the four articles of impeachment. Sacheverell was accused of preaching the doctrine of non-resistance, claiming that resistance had not been used to bring about the 1688 Revolution, of stating that the toleration of Dissenters was unreasonable, that the Church of England was in peril, and that the Queen's ministers imperilled the constitution of both Church and State. Sir Simon Harcourt led Sacheverell's defence, which consisted mainly of attempts to show that what Sacheverell had said could not bear the construction put upon it by his accusers. On the whole this meant evading the issue or indulging in sophisticated casuistry. In many ways this reflected the Tory party's own dilemmas in coming to terms with the Revolution. One of Sacheverell's counsels, Mr. Dodd, claimed: "My Lords, Non-Resistance in general we do assert as a Rule, yet we agree there is an Exception implied in that Rule, and that Exception, we say, was the Case of the Revolution."¹⁵⁷ Mr. Phipps, another defence counsel, argued; "The Toleration Act is not what

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., xvi, 292. 2 Feb. 1710. The voting was 182 to 88, with Bromley and Dixie Windsor, members for Oxford and Cambridge universities, acting as tellers for the opposition.

¹⁵⁷ The Tryal of Dr. Henry Sacheverell (London, 1710), p. 201. See this work for all the speeches on both sides.

the Doctor finds fault with, but the Persons that Abuse it; and I beg leave to say, that the ill Use which is made of it, is unreasonable and unwarrantable. But that the Doctor asserts the Toleration itself to be unreasonable, or the Allowance of it unwarrantable, will appear to be a great mistake." ¹⁵⁸ In fact, to a non-juror like Thomas Hearne, Sacheverell had retreated from his position as the upholder of those high Church doctrines, passive obedience and non-resistance. ¹⁵⁹ The Whigs may have had the better of the argument at the trial, but the issue now transcended the confines of Westminster. James Hilton wrote later of "these bustling times wherein Whig and Tory is the only conversation, but the Tories talk the loudest in the coffee-houses." ¹⁶⁰ It was the Sacheverell trial which set the populace about the ears. It became an emotion-charged case of defending Whig and Tory principles. Each side insisted upon the Revolution or the Church. In the end the political reaction inside and outside parliament counted for far more than the skill of the contending counsels or the merits of Dr. Sacheverell's sermon.

The London mob may not have been able to follow the sophisticated arguments of Walpole or Harcourt, but they understood an attack upon a high Church clergyman. When the trial opened he was accompanied to Westminster Hall by a vast concourse of people, wishing him long life and prosperity,

158 Ibid., p. 265.

159 Hearne, 11, 366.

160 H. M. C., Kenyon Mss., p. 444. To George Kenyon, Gray's Inn, 20 July 1710.

and during the proceedings he was prayed for in many London churches.¹⁶¹ While the trial progressed the mob attacked several Dissenters' meeting-houses, including that of Daniel Burgess.¹⁶² The populace were clearly on the side of Dr. Sacheverell and it was not long before this swing in public opinion was reflected in the House of Lords. Several peers began to trim their sails to the strengthening Tory wind. Both Somerset and Lord Rivers were suspected of being false to the Whigs and the duke of Cleveland was only prevented by the persuasion of the duke of Richmond from following his wife's orders and voting for Sacheverell.¹⁶³ The decision of the Lords was long drawn-out and anxiously awaited on all sides. On 14 March, the peers resolved, by 65 to 47 votes, that the words supposed to be criminal need not necessarily be expressed in the articles of impeachment. Thirty-two peers, all Tories except the earl of Scarborough, registered their dissent.¹⁶⁴ Four days later forty-five peers protested that they should not have to give a simple verdict of guilty or not guilty to the charge as a whole, but that they should be allowed to vote on each

161 H.M.C., Ancaster Mss., p. 439. — to the countess of Lindsey, 23 Feb. 1709/10; and Hearne, ii, 350.

162 Ibid., ii, 351.

163 Durham University Library. Clavering papers. Ann Clavering to James Clavering, 18 and 23 Mar. 1710. Ann Clavering wrote an excellent series of letters on the trial.

164 Lords' Journals, xix, 107. The dissentient peers were Abingdon, Anglesea, Beaufort, Berkshire, Conway, Craven, Denbigh, Ferrers, Guernsey, Guilford, Howard, Jersey, Leeds, Lempster, Northampton, North and Grey, Nottingham, Osborne, Plymouth, Rochester, Scarsdale, Stawell, Sussex, Thanet, Weymouth, Willoughby de Broke, Yarmouth, the archbishop of York, the bishops of London, Durham, and Chester, and the earl of Scarborough.

separate article of the impeachment.¹⁶⁵ On 20 March the Lords voted Dr. Sacheverell guilty by a majority of 69 to 52 votes.¹⁶⁶ The majority included both Rivers and Peterborough who had been recently working with the Tories. They had both originally been Whigs and so their decision was not altogether a shock. What did come as a surprise was the decision of Winchelsea, who was a relative of Nottingham and who had always sided with the Tories, to vote against Sacheverell. Among the minority were Shrewsbury, who had been a prominent supporter of the Revolution, but who may at this time be reckoned a Tory, three Scottish peers, Hamilton, Mar, and Northesk, and one Whig, the earl of Scarborough. Among the absentees was Somerset. Perhaps even more significant than this vote was the

165 Ibid., xix, 113. Apart from 3 Scottish peers, Hamilton, Mar, and Northesk, and the duke of Shrewsbury, a former Whig who was now moving in Tory circles, the list reads like a roll call of the Tory peers, viz. Abingdon, Anglesey, Beaufort, Berkshire, Buckingham, Conway, Craven, Dartmouth, Denbigh, Ferrers, Haversham, Howard, Guernsey, Guilford, Jersey, Leeds, Leigh, Lempster, Loxington, Northampton, North and Grey, Nottingham, Ormond, Osborne, Poulett, Plymouth, Rochester, Scarsdale, Stawell, Sussex, Thanet, Weston, Weymouth, Willoughby de Broke, Yarmouth, the archbishop of York, and the bishops of Durham, London, Chester, Rochester, and Bath and Wells.

166 Lords' Debates, ii, 276-8; and Parliamentary History, vi, 886-87, where there are full lists of all the peers, who voted on either side (except that only 68 peers are listed among the majority). The 52 opposition peers included the 45 who had protested on the 18 March, plus Berkeley of Stratton, Chandos, Northumberland, Pembroke, Say and Seale, Scarborough, and Wemyss. A protest was signed by 47 peers; all the 52 except Ferrers, Haversham, Northumberland, Pembroke, and Wemyss. Lords' Journals, xix, 115.

punishment pronounced next day. Dr. Sacheverell was suspended from preaching for a period of three years and his sermon was ordered to be burned at the Royal Exchange by the common hangman.¹⁶⁷ The mild punishment produced bonfires and illuminations among the delighted London populace.¹⁶⁸ Sacheverell was given a benefice in North Wales and, on his journey thither in the summer, he was given a rapturous reception by the gentry and ordinary folk.¹⁶⁹ Gervase Scrope gave an account of a stage in this procession: "Doctor Sacheverell is the Idol of this country and they look on all who voted against him to be dissenters and enemys to the Church. He is to come and dine here this week, and Mr. Cresswell designs to convey him to Bridgnorth with as much pomp and attendance from the bailiffs and recorder of the Town as he was met with at Banbury, Warwick, etc."¹⁷⁰

For months the Sacheverell affair was a major political issue. The Tories drummed up loyal addresses to the Queen, full of high Church sentiments, from all over the country.¹⁷¹ The whole topic, wrote James Taylor to Henry Watkins, "begetts heats in all Company & flushes the

167 When the sermon was burned, the lord mayor, Sir Charles Duncomb, who was also a Tory M.P., did not attend as had been ordered. Luttrell, vi, 562.

168 Hearne, ii, 364.

169 Ibid., iii, 12.

170 Lincoln Record Office. Monson papers 7/13/123. To Sir John Newton, Sidbury, 26 June 1710. In May Sacheverell had accompanied that other fiery high Church divine, Francis Atterbury, on his visitation to Tavistock. Devon Record Office. Drake-King correspondence. Book 1, f. 29. Francis Drake to Peter King, 5 May 1710.

171 Collection of Addresses (2 vols., London, 1710-11).

high-flyers to so great a degree that they make themselves drunk with his commendations and that party spitts so much venom in their Addresses that they seem to be sure of success but of what I cannot tell, nor do they themselves hardly know what they would be at."¹⁷² James Brydges, a man of moderate Tory inclinations who had sold out to the Court, had always opposed the trial and was now feeling distinctly uneasy: "This last Prosecution of Sacheverell upon ye point of Passive Obedience hath revived those disputes wch had bin buried for 15 years & upwards; it hath raised a very great ferment in ye Kingdom, Set all Pens, pro & con, at work & fetcht up Addresses from all parts of ye Kingdom."¹⁷³ The earl of Shaftesbury must have been the only confident Whig in the country when he declared: "Tho' the several partys of Torys and other false brethren of the Whiggs are more united and in concert than ever, so that by means of some disturbances at Court their party seems prodigiously formidable, yet they never were in a better way of ruining themselves and their cause, nor was the principle of liberty and hatred of slavery and priestcraft ever higher in its ascendant."¹⁷⁴

The greater unity of the Whig party and the greater coherence of their political principles had enabled them to triumph over the numerically

172 B.M.Add.Ms. 33273, f. 29. Letter dated Whitehall, 9 May 1710.

173 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, iii, f. 204.
To Cadogan, 7 April 1710.

174 Original Letters of Locke, Algernon Sidney, and Anthony, Lord Shaftesbury, ed. Thomas Forster (London, 1830), p. 261. To Mr. Furley, Reygate, 22 May 1710.

superior, but divided, Tories. By the end of 1708 the Whigs were entrenched at Court and in parliament, but their victory proved short-lived. The problem of the poor Palatinos had aroused general dissatisfaction. The burden of the war, in both men and money, was becoming insupportable to a majority of the nation, which felt aggrieved at the failure to negotiate a satisfactory peace. The Sacheverell trial completed the swing of political opinion away from the Whigs and towards the Tories in 1710. At the same time, the 1709-10 session had shown the representatives of the moderate and high Tories, namely Harley and Bromley, working in closer co-operation than at any other time during the reign. Nevertheless, the ministerial revolution of 1710 was achieved neither in parliament nor in the country at large, but at Court. It was very much the achievement of one man, Robert Harley.

Harley's overthrow of the Godolphin ministry was achieved by a three pronged attack; on the Tories, on the uncommitted Whigs, and on the Queen. In the first place he decided the Court should base its support more on moderate Tories than on Junto Whigs. It was to this end that he had sought a rapprochement with Bromley. Secondly, he looked for support from moderate men, even of a Whiggish complexion. The duke of Newcastle, for instance, though a moderate Whig, had been a Harleyite in the difficult months of 1704-5. The duke had deserted Harley in 1708, but, with changing circumstances, Harley's persuasive arguments, and a possible marriage alliance between the two families, he again became a useful

ally.¹⁷⁵ Harley was as assiduous with other peers. In the summer of 1708 he began arranging secret meetings with Earl Rivers, who had earlier been sent to Spain with reinforcements, but had returned home after refusing to serve under Galway. Dissatisfied with the ministry and his Whig friends he was a suitable target for Harley's advances. On 15 July 1708 Harley wrote secretively: "I will come to yr Hous after tis dark if it be convenient, if not tomorrow att the same tyme: being very desirous to see you."¹⁷⁶ It was not too long before the government got wind of these exchanges, and Godolphin warned Marlborough not to trust Rivers: "Whatever professions he has made to you, or does now underhand make to me, I am of opinion he is at bottom entire with Harley, for birds of a feather flock together."¹⁷⁷ At the same time Godolphin had to acknowledge that the earl of Mar had also been seduced: "I must also let you know that he [Mar] is thought to be very deeply engaged with the Tories, and particularly with Harley, by alliance, as well as by inclination."¹⁷⁸ A prominent and popular Harley recruit was the earl of Peterborough. He

175 See, O.R.F. Davies, 'The Wealth and Influence of John Holles, Duke of Newcastle 1694-1711', Renaissance and Modern Studies (1965), ix, 22-46; Angus McInnes, 'The Political Ideas of Robert Harley', History (1965), L, no. 170, p. 314; and H.M.C., Portland Mss, ii, passim.

176 B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/156/3.

177 The Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, ii, 363. Letter dated St. James's, 9 Aug. 1709. Rivers voted against Dr. Sacheverell, but did show other signs of working with Harley.

178 Ibid., ii, 365. To Marlborough, Windsor, 11 Aug. 1709. Mar voted with the Tories in the Sacheverell trial.

had achieved some striking successes in Spain,¹⁷⁹ but had been recalled by the ministry because of his inability to serve amicably with Charles III and Galway.¹⁸⁰ The attack on his conduct had pushed this former Whig into the arms of the Tories. Lord Shaftesbury could see the danger: "I am sorry for the quarrel our friend Id P[eterborough] is engaged in with ye Ministry; but not so much with ye Ministry (for they are rather neuters), as with our old Whiggs. He being more in the party of a certain Gent., a friend of ours [Harley], who in a manner stands single, being broken from his old party, and equally hated by both."¹⁸¹

Harley's most useful convert was undoubtedly the duke of Shrewsbury. The Duke had been a prominent supporter of the Revolution and a leading Whig peer under William III. He had then spent the early years of Anne's reign in Italy, where he had married an Italian lady. On his return to England he did not pick up his old ties with the Junto, but for a time held aloof from any involvement in politics. However, by May 1708, he was arranging meetings with Harley and Harcourt.¹⁸² As was

179 See my two articles, 'Peterborough and the capture of Barcelona, 1705', History Today (1964), xiv, 705-15, and 'The Earl of Peterborough's Campaign in Valencia, 1706', The Journal of the Society of Army Historical Research (1967), xv, 35-52.

180 See my unpublished Durham M.A. thesis (1963), 'British Military and Naval Operations in Catalonia and Valencia', pp. 128-186.

181 Original Letters of Locke, Algernon Sidney, and Anthony, Lord Shaftesbury, ed. T. Forster, pp. 246-47. To Mr. Furley, St. Giles, 15 Jan. 1708/9. This was written before Harley had completed his rapprochement with the Tories.

182 H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 191. To Robert Harley, 6 May 1708.

his wont, Harley wished for clandestine meetings, though Shrewsbury preferred to meet openly.¹⁸³ Before the opening of the 1709-10 session he and Harley were concerting their actions,¹⁸⁴ though Marlborough, at first, did not take the alliance seriously.¹⁸⁵ When Shrewsbury voted in favour of Dr. Sacheverell, Marlborough no doubt realised his mistake. During the Sacheverell trial other Whig peers began to waver before the Tory storm. Henry St. John was able to tell Harley that both Argyll and Somerset were prepared to negotiate with him.¹⁸⁶ Neither could bring himself to support Dr. Sacheverell, but they were both open to Harley's blandishments. Lord Orrery explained to Harley:

"I have obeyed your commands to the D[uke] of A[rgyll]; he says he can't bring himself up entirely to vote for an acquittal, because he has freely and openly given his opinion that the sermon deserves censure, and he does not see how he can with any reputation alter that opinion so suddenly. He thinks too that an absolute acquittal would rather tend to promote a High Tory scheme than to ruin the interest of the Junto, besides he's afraid he should prejudice his interest in Scotland by it; However he

183 Ibid., i, 191. To Robert Harley, 29 July 1708. Shrewsbury was also reconciled to Peterborough through Harley's mediation. H.M.C., Downshire Mss., I, ii, 866. Earl Poulett to Sir William Trumbull, London, 10 Dec. 1708.

184 H.M.C., Bath Mss., i, 197. Shrewsbury to Harley, 18 Sept. 1709.

185 The Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, i, 202. Marlborough to his wife, 19 Aug. 1709.

186 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 535-36. St. John to Harley, 8 and 9 March 1709/10.

thinks he may fairly oppose any excessive punishments that shall be proposed, and he believes the Duke of So[mer]set may be brought to concur with him in that."¹⁸⁷

Argyll was a valuable ally because of his military reputation and because of his influence in Scotland, but, in the context of English politics, the capture of Somerset was a greater prize. He was rich, his wife was a favourite of the Queen, and his Whiggism was unimpeachable. His pride, which was notorious, suffered from the neglect of the Junto and he was soon deep in Harley's schemes.¹⁸⁸ For this, and for not voting in the Sacheverell trial,¹⁸⁹ he was expelled from the Kit-Cat Club. Yet such was the success of Harley's intrigues that Godolphin had to report that even the Junto had opened tentative negotiations with him: "4 [Halifax], 5 [Somers], and 6 [Sunderland] and generally the rest of 89 [the Whigs] are so uneasy that they are ready to make their court to 199 [Harley] who appears as ready to receive it and is making advances and professions almost to everyone that he thinks are friends."¹⁹⁰

The recruitment of such Whigs as Shrewsbury and Somerset owed much to Harley's skill in political management and to his reputation as a

187 Ibid., iv, 537. Tuesday (14 March 1709/10?). Argyll subsequently voted against Sacheverell, but his arguments were couched in a moderate vein and he was rewarded with the garter. Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, iii, f. 204. James Brydges to William Cadogan, 7 April 1710.

188 See his letters to Harley arranging secret meetings. H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 542, Kensington, 24 May 1710; and B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/156/6, 13 July 1710.

189 Coxe, v, 155. Godolphin to Marlborough, 20 Mar. 1710.

190 B.M.Add.Ms. 9109, f. 83. To Marlborough, 29 May 1710.

moderate, unwilling to accept the dictation of party extremists. It is commonly forgotten that Henry St. John had a share in this policy of broadening the basis of support by enlisting moderate Whigs. After his fall in 1708 St. John is usually portrayed as immediately reverting to his former high Tory stance. Though he was probably somewhat cooler towards Harley personally, after his failure to gain re-election in 1708, he could still see the wisdom of trying to persuade influential men like Somerset and Argyll to desert the Whigs. A great opportunist and generally an excellent reader of the political situation he recognised that only Harley's policies could achieve success at this juncture. In March 1710 he was active in Harley's intrigues: "I went from you to Court where I met Lord R[ivers] and the D. of Ar[gyll]; they both told me that Hampden had been this day with the D. of Som[erset] to tell him that he was empowered to let his Grace know that, if he was engaged in any measures where their assistance was necessary; he and his friends were ready to follow his directions." ¹⁹¹ Next day, he was expressing the hope that Argyll might be persuaded to vote on the right side in the Sacheverell trial. ¹⁹² The importance of St. John in Harley's schemes was recognised by others. James Brydges told Cadogan that St. John was very high in the new schemes ¹⁹³ and the same day he wrote to Drummond: "Matters run very

191 H. M. C., Portland Mss., iv, 538. To Robert Harley, 8 March 1709/10.

192 Ibid., p. 536. To Harley, 9 March 1709/10.

193 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, iii, f. 271.
Letter dated 20 May 1710.

high at Court & ye new schemes of Administration grows very fast

Your friends Mr. Harley & Mr. St. John are very near at ye top of it &
likely to be ye most considerable in it.¹⁹⁴"

The keystone of the ministerial revolution, however, was undoubtedly Robert Harley. It was he who won over Tories like Bromley and Rochester, and he who won the allegiance of Whigs like Shrewsbury and Somerset. Yet even these two successful policies would have been of no avail had Harley not carried the third prong of his attack, the enlistment of the Queen's favour. Before his fall in 1708 Harley had been close to the Queen and to the rising favourite, Abigail Masham, and thereafter his influence over them increased rather than diminished. The Whigs might have captured political office, but Harley had the Queen's ear. There were frequent back-stairs rendezvous and regular exchanges of coded letters with Abigail.¹⁹⁵ Marlborough and Godolphin learned of these intrigues and recognised the serious threat to their position. The general complained to the Queen that Harley's intrigues with her rendered the lord treasurer's task well-nigh impossible.¹⁹⁶ He was soon in real difficulties in his own sphere. In January 1710 the duke came near to losing his patronage, and

194 Ibid., f. 270. Letter dated 20 May 1710.

195 See Harley's letters to Mrs. Masham, 16 and 31 Oct. 1708, in Longleat House, Portland papers, vol. x, ff. 55 and 59. The cypher they used, and other examples of their notes, are in B.M. Portland (Harley) papers, Loan 29/38/1.

196 B.M. Add. Ms. 34518, f. 48. Letter dated 15 Sept. 1709. See the Queen's reply, dated Windsor, 25 Oct. 1709. Ibid., f. 49.

indeed his authority, over army commissions. In that month Lord Essex died, vacating both the lieutenancy of the Tower and a regiment. The former went to Earl Rivers, a recent Harley convert, and the Queen proposed giving the regiment to Colonel Hill, Abigail Masham's brother. Marlborough refused to attend the cabinet, but it was only the threat of a parliamentary motion against Abigail's influence that forced the Queen to capitulate. However, Arthur Maynwaring warned the duchess of Marlborough it was this threat and not the fear of losing Marlborough which had worried the Queen and Harley. ¹⁹⁷ Clearly the great commander ¹⁹⁸ had not his former influence over the Queen.

By the spring of 1710 Harley was in a position to remodel the ministry. It must be stressed that it was he, and not the Tory party, who was in a position to oust the Whigs. Moreover, he was not prepared simply to lead a Tory ministry back in to power. He feared that this might again allow the Tories, especially the high-fliers, to dictate policy. It was Harley's plan to keep the real political power in his own hands or in those of moderate men whom he could trust. This decision did not please the Tories and it was this difference of policy

197 Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. E. 25. Letter without date, but clearly about January 1710. See a similar account in a letter, without address or signature, dated 28 Jan. 1709/10, in Leicester Record Office, Finch Mss., box vi, bundle 23.

198 Coxe, v, 125-148; and The Wentworth Papers, pp. 102-3. Peter Wentworth to Lord Raby, London, 24 Jan. 1710.

and indeed of principle which was to create the tension in the Harley ministry of 1710-1714. Harley could not prevent disputes between the Tories and himself nor could he avoid making concessions to them. But his great influence with the Queen was a great stumbling block to the creation of a genuine Tory ministry. In the last resort this influence was to thwart St. John's challenge for the leadership.

In 1710 Harley made piecemeal changes, to replace Whigs by his own moderate supporters. In April the marquis of Kent, though a moderate Whig, was replaced by the more dependable and valuable duke of Shrewsbury. This did not immediately alarm Godolphin, who believed that he would be able to work amicably with Shrewsbury.¹⁹⁹ In June, however, the earl of Sunderland was dismissed, despite the protests of Marlborough,²⁰⁰ the directors of the Bank of England,²⁰¹ and the representatives of the allied powers.²⁰² Sunderland was replaced by Lord Dartmouth, a moderate Tory and one of Harley's personal adherents. Harley then plotted to remove Godolphin himself. His plan was to put the treasury into commission and,

199 See his letter to Marlborough, 25 April 1710. Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. BII-28. By his letter of 12 May, Godolphin had begun to change his mind.

200 Ibid. E 25. Letter without date. It had no effect. See Godolphin to Marlborough, 13 June 1710. Ibid. BII-8.

201 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, iv, f. 27. James Brydges to George Brydges, 17 June 1710; and Bodleian Library. Ballard Mss. 31, f. 84. William Bishop to Dr. Charlett, 24 June 1710.

202 Levens Hall Mss. Box B, bundle B 2. William Bromley to James Grahme, 16 July 1710; and Luttrell, vi, 614.

on 2 August, Shrewsbury asked Sir Thomas Hanmer to accept one of the
²⁰³
places on it. Hanmer's refusal probably delayed Godolphin's fall for
a day or two, but on the 7th the Queen requested the lord treasurer to
²⁰⁴
break his staff. The new treasury commission was headed by Harley
himself, and included Earl Poulett, Sir Thomas Mansell, Henry Paget, and
²⁰⁵
Robert Benson; all of them personal adherents of Harley. This was
²⁰⁶
apparently as far as Harley wished to go at this stage, but he did not
get his own way. John Smith, the chancellor of the exchequer resigned,
²⁰⁷
though Harley had hoped to retain him. Harley appealed to Henry Boyle,
secretary of state, promising to serve him in any way he wished, but to no
²⁰⁸ ²⁰⁹
avail. A similar appeal to Lord Cowper was also turned down. It
is unlikely that Harley tried to blackmail Robert Walpole into staying in
²¹⁰
the ministry, but the latter did retain his treasurership of the navy
though relinquishing his post as secretary at war. Harley feared that
Marlborough would resign, though, in that contingency, he was prepared to
send Earl Rivers to Hanover to offer the command of the army to the

203 The Correspondence of Sir Thomas Hanmer, ed. Sir Henry Bunbury
(London, 1838), p. 127.

204 Blenheim Palace. Marlborough papers. BII-32. The Queen to
Godolphin, 7 Aug. 1710.

205 Luttrell, vi, 616.

206 Onslow's note, Burnet, vi, 13 n.

207 Shropshire Record Office. Lord Forester Mss. 1224/13. Sir William
Forester to George Weld, 10 Aug. 1710. Smith did accept a post as
one of the tellers of the exchequer.

208 Chatsworth House. Devonshire papers. 102.2. Harley to Boyle,
11 Aug. 1710.

209 The Private Diary of William, first Earl Cowper, ed. E. C. Hawtrey
(Roxburghe Club, 1833), pp. 42-46. 27 Aug. - 22 Sept.

210 An argument used by Coxe, Memoirs of the Life and Administration of
Sir Robert Walpole (3rd ed., London, 1816), 1, 32, and refuted by
J. H. Plumb, Sir Robert Walpole, 1, 165 n.

211
Elector. After considerable hesitation Marlborough decided to retain
212
his command.

Harley's plans to keep the more moderate Whigs in a mixed
ministry failed, but not before he had roused the resentment of the Tories.
In mid-August some of them sent Atterbury to Harley, demanding further
213
changes and a dissolution of parliament. Lord Rochester boldly told
the Queen: "The plan to form a government which would remain independent
of party was unworkable. Neither he nor any other member of the High
Church party would serve with men who did not agree in principle with
214
them." William Bromley had greater trust in Harley's wisdom, but even
his explanation of the latter's policy showed some traces of suspicion:

"The Scene being opened I have had repeated assurances
that no Interest will be considered but the Church's.
They are willing to make their Bottom as wide as they can,
& to receive those who are of Distinction, & have no
Blemish, provided they will come in on the same Interest.
Some who have been very instrumental in bringing about
this great work must be taken care of, & we must not
grudge & envy them any Advantage, such as E[arl] R[ivers],
Arg[yll] & his Brother. This is the Language to me." 215

Harley was compelled to make changes in any case with the resignation of
the Whig ministers, including Somers, Orford, and Wharton. He was forced
to bring in more Tories, but he did manage to win the wholehearted support

-
- 211 Shropshire Record Office. Lord Forester Mss. 1224/13. Sir William
Forester to George Weld, 10 Aug. 1710.
212 Carlisle Record Office. Lonsdale Mss. D/Lons., bundle 12. James
Lowther to William Gilpin.
213 Felix Salomon, Geschichte des letzten Ministeriums Königin Annas von
England, p. 36.
214 Hoffmann's report. Cited by Onno Klopp, Der Fall des Hauses Stuart
(Wien, 1881-88), xiii, 486.
215 Levens Hall Mss. Box B, file B 2. To James Grahme, 1 Sept. 1710.

of Lord Rochester. The latter replaced Lord Somers as lord president of the council. With such an important post, and with his known ambition and pride, it might have seemed a risky move. Yet Rochester did not challenge Harley's leadership and became quite amenable. A few months later St. John was writing in some surprise: "My Lord Rochester has more [good] temper than he ever showed in his life, and I must do him the justice to say, that I never knew a man more easy to be lived with." ²¹⁶ Other changes, that were made at the same time as Rochester's appointment, included Harcourt as lord keeper, the duke of Ormonde as lord lieutenant of Ireland, Buckingham as lord steward, George Granville as secretary at war, and Henry St. John as secretary of state for the northern department.

Henry St. John had been deep in Harley's schemes to oust the Godolphin ministry, and he had helped in the negotiations with Somerset and others. Once the plan began to succeed he expected a leading post in the new ministry. He was shocked to learn that Harley's idea of a suitable reward was to appoint him secretary at war, his former post. He made it clear that he expected something better than this: "I am indifferent what employment is reserved for me, but I must own that to succeed Mr. Cardonnel, upon the same foot as Mr. Cardonnel was, is not coming into the service a second time with so good a grace as I came in

216 Bolingbroke's Corr., 1, 28. To Drummond, Whitehall, 28 Nov. 1710.

the first; and keeping one's present situation is a good deal better than sinking while one affects to rise."²¹⁷ A few months later it was rumoured that he might become treasurer of the navy.²¹⁸ This was a post that Robert Walpole held, in addition to ^{the duties of} the secretaryship of war, in Cardonnel's absence abroad, and so St. John was hardly likely to accept the offer. After two years in the wilderness he was determined to hold out for a much better post. It was almost certain that he had his eyes on a secretaryship of state and Harley's wish to retain Henry Boyle would suggest that he was most reluctant to oblige St. John. An anecdote in Mr. Carte's memorandum-book suggests that there was a temporary breach between Harley and St. John on this issue:

"L. L. on the 28th of June, 1725, told me, that Mr. Harley, at the time he was bringing about the change in the ministry, in 1710, was near quarrelling with lord Harcourt and Bolingbroke. He had a mind to fix them [sic] in thoir old posts of secretary of war; which he refusing to agree to, they came to L. L. and told him the case, and that there was no doing anything with him, and therefore, they determined to go, the one into Oxfordshire and the other into Berkshire, next morning."²¹⁹

If this was so, and it seems in character, it had the desired effect. By 12 September 1710²²⁰ Harley had decided to suggest that the Queen should make St. John secretary of state, although the appointment was not made until the 21st.

217 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 536. To Robert Harley, 8 Mar. 1709/10.

218 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, iv, f. 96.

James Brydges to Adam de Cardonnell, 11 July 1710.

219 Cited in Original Papers, ed. James Macpherson, ii, 531.

220 Harley's memorandum, B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/10/19.

Though St. John was no doubt piqued that Harley did not hold him at his own valuation, he was not entirely opposed to Harley's schemes. He probably believed that Harley could not construct a mixed ministry for he wrote to his old crony, James Brydges: "The treaty you mention I was not let into the secret of. I can only say that it seems to me very difficult, if not utterly impossible, to carry on with success a negotiation of that kind between parties amongst whom there is not the least confidence remaining."²²¹ Yet, though he envisaged a more Tory scheme than Harley, he recognised the need to pursue rather devious means to accomplish certain political ends. In a letter to Sir William Trumbull he seemed to be trying to justify his part in Harley's intrigues: "The principles I establish'd, and the views I propos'd att first to myself, I have every day seen more reason to pursue; and I can say with great truth, and a little pride, that I have never deviated from either. The Secrets of a Court and ye intrigues of party, will alter ye appearance of things; but, to continue ye former allegory, a Pilot is often oblig'd to steer a western course, to arrive att ye post which lies northward."²²² A letter to Lord Orrery expressed a similar viewpoint: "I begin now to see my way; & tho' in every respect it will not be possible, for reasons which I gave in my last, & for some wch I will give you by the first conveyance that offers itself safer than the post, to play the game just as we would wish

221 Huntington Library, California. Stowe Mss. ST. 57, vi, f. 157.
Letter dated 1 Aug. 1710.

222 Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers. Trumbull Add. Mss. 133,
letter 41. Letter dated 31 Aug. 1710.

to do, or as we at first propos'd, yet certainly with common address, & uncommon steadiness, we may be able to build up as well as we have been to pull down." The letter goes on to show that, though St. John wished to build the ministry on a Tory foundation, he did not envisage any capitulation to the extremists. He was still confident that Harley, though he wished him to make greater concessions to the Tories, held the keys to the situation:

"It is incredible to what a degree 353 [the Whigs?] are united in opposition; but their numbers will soon diminish if the 400 [Tories?] can be made to proceed reasonably; wch I do not really much doubt, tho I must think that we do take these in with the best grace, & with the greatest advantage to ourselves. Several persons imagine that the new measures of 100 [Harley?] cannot last; these will come over, as soon as they see a firm foundation of strength lay'd. Others are alarm'd & expect the utmost violence of a contrary extream; these will likewise be recover'd when they find 400 [the Tories] kept in order, and the true interest pursued."²²³

St. John was now back in office and for the first time really in the front rank. His two years out of parliament had virtually broken his near dependence on Harley, but they had increased his awareness of the depth of Tory feeling in the country at large. He was beginning to see his chance of leading the Tory country gentlemen from the front-bench, as in his early career he had aspired to do from the back-benches. For this reason he was almost certainly in favour of a dissolution and an immediate general election to catch the strong Tory tide. Moreover,

²²³ Bodleian Library. English Mss. Misc. E. 180, ff. 9-10. Letter dated 22 Aug. 1710 (copy).

since he was a secretary of state but not at the moment an M.P., it was only natural that he should seek to return to the Commons at the earliest opportunity. As early as June 1710 he had been laying plans for his return and he had canvassed his old patron and mentor, Sir William Trumbull, for support in Berkshire: "I am pitch'd upon by so many of those persons, who think on publick affairs as I do, to joyn with Mr. John Stonehouse, whenever a new Election shall happen, that I have resolv'd to obey their commands, and to neglect nothing in my power wch may contribute towards making ye Church interest the prevailing one in our Country I will hope to have the resolution I have taken justify'd by yr approbation."²²⁴ In case of strong opposition at Berkshire, he told James Brydges, he expected to regain his old seat at Wootton-Basset: "You have certainly done exstreamly right in acting as if a dissolution was inevitable I do not yet hear of any opposition att all wch I am likely to meet with at Wootton Bassott, & if any should be form'd, it can do me little hurt, & give me little trouble."²²⁵

Despite the dismissal of Sunderland and Godolphin and the failure to retain Cowper, Robert Harley was opposed to any capitulation to the Tory party. In this stand he had the support of Shrewsbury, Somerset, and Newcastle, all now prominent in his counsels, but none of

224 Berkshire Record Office. Downshire papers. Trumbull Add. Mss. 133, letter 39, ff. 1-2. Dated Bucklebury, 2 June 1710.

225 'The Letters of Henry St. John to James Brydges', ed. Godfrey Davies and Marion Tinling, Huntington Library Bulletin (Oct. 1935), no. 8, p. 168. Letter dated London, 1 Aug. 1710.

them a clear Tory. He had little support from the Tories. The earl of Nottingham was warned by his daughter that Tories of his stamp could not expect to play a great part in the new scheme:

"I'm sure I every day wish yr Idsp here for many reasons, & among ye rest, that Mr. Harley may know what to value yr Labours at, for he brags that both yu & my uncle Guernsey, are now so pleas'd that my Id Anglesey & my Id Dartmouth are employ'd that yu both must do journey man's work under them, or else keep out of ye way of opposeing; that 'twas never to be thought of to bring in ye Leaders or high torys such as yr self & my Id Rochester, into ye administration; for that woud be as contrary to their rule of moderation as to keep in ye violent whigs."²²⁶

Even William Bromley, rapidly falling under Harley's spell, confessed unhappily: "I am sensibly the dilatory proceedings have given some strength as well as courage to our Enemies, & have wearied & disheartened our friends."²²⁷ According to Swift, Harley feared that if he brought in too many Tories, and reinforced this by a Tory general election victory, he would find it impossible to control the extremists.²²⁸

Harley, himself, protested: "I think our friends have an opportunity now of recovering all their former mistakes, if they will not be mad beyond the help of Helebore, it is very practicable to restore what is lost; ... I must say this it will be impossible to serve them if they will be obstinately in the wrong."²²⁹ St. John joined the other Tories in

²²⁶ Leicester Record Office. Finch Mss. Box vi, bundle 23. Letter dated 31 Aug. 1710.

²²⁷ Bodleian Library. Ballard Mss. 38, f. 150 v. To Dr. Charlett, 12 Aug. 1710.

²²⁸ Journal to Stella, i, 44. 6 Oct. 1710.

²²⁹ B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/171/2. To William Stratford, 5 Sept. 1710.

pressing for a dissolution, though Somerset was even more determined in his opposition to such a move. "44 [Somerset] is out of Town," St. John told Lord Orrery, "but I think he is to return towards the end of this week. I expect him to be very much out of humour. Its prodigious to see a man so zealous for a proposition, & so averse to everything necessary to support and make that good."²³⁰ The Whigs bitterly opposed a dissolution in such a pro-Tory climate. While Sunderland hoped Newcastle would not approve such a measure,²³¹ Somerset gave it out that he "ever would be a Whig, that he would serve them in all elections, and would oppose a dissolution to the utmost."²³² Harley was now under severe pressure from both parties and he was finding it extremely difficult

230 Bodleian Library. English Mss. Misc. E. 180, f. 10. Letter dated 22 Aug. 1710.

231 B.M. Lansdowne Ms. 1236, f. 255. Sunderland to Newcastle, London, 31 Aug. 1710.

232 H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 592. On 19 Sept. 1710, after the dissolution was decided upon, James Craggs told General Erle: "His Grace of Summersett is now more angry with the new Ministry than he was with the old & explodes the dissolution as a destructive step to the publick." Cherborough Park. Erle papers. After the elections, when he supported the Whigs, Somerset still hoped to attend the cabinet council, "upon which, Mr. Secretary St. John refused to assist; and gave his Reasons; that He would never sit in Council, with a Man who had so often betrayed them; and was openly engaged with a Faction, which endeavoured to obstruct all Her Majesty's Measures." Somerset stopped attending. 'History of the Last Four Years of Queen Anne'. Swift's Prose Works, vii, 14. In August 1711 Somerset again tried to sit on the cabinet council, but St. John again refused to countenance this. Swift's Corr., i, 278. To Archbishop King, 26 Aug. 1711.

to hold the middle ground. He was compelled to make another concession. The Queen dissolved parliament, for, as Harley himself admitted to Newcastle, "it is impossible to carry on Parliament without intolerable heats." It was in the same letter that he announced that St. John and Harcourt would be coming into the ministry. Two days later he was having to bring Buckingham and Rochester into the ministry.²³³ The situation was beginning to slip out of his control.

Harley now realised the ministry had to veer more towards the Tories than he had wished, but he was still anxious to avoid having his hands tied by the Tory extremists. His greatest fear now was that the general election would produce an overwhelming Tory majority and, to avoid this eventuality, he refrained from using Court influence to the full on their behalf.²³⁴ For example, very few lord lieutenants were changed, and Wharton in Westmorland, Orford in Cambridgeshire, and Bolton in Dorset, all retained these influential posts. Many Tories expressed their dissatisfaction. William Bromley complained to Atterbury, Sir Robert Davers warned Harley himself that changes were expected, and William Stratford told Harley's son, Edward, that Oxford University was puzzled at the commission of admiralty and the disposal of other places.²³⁵ The

233 H.M.C., Portland Mss., ii, 219-20. Harley to Newcastle, 14 Sept., and Halifax to Newcastle, 16 Sept. 1710.

234 Mary Ransome, 'The General Election of 1710', London M.A. thesis (1939), pp. 110, 114, 123.

235 The Miscellaneous Works of Atterbury, i, 444. Bromley to Atterbury, 23 Sept. 1710; H.M.C., Portland Mss., iv, 590. Davers to Robert Harley, 6 Sept. 1710; and, ibid., vii, 20. William Stratford to Edward Harley, Oxford, 4 Oct. 1710.

most disgruntled Tories were the followers of Nottingham. John Ward, a staunch Nottinghamite Tory, complained to that noble earl:

"I have been so happy as to agree with your Lordsp. that changing the Lieutenancy & commission of peace (being the immediate influence on the country) as well as changes at Court were necessary to a good parliament & have always pressed it accordingly where I have had the opportunity. But nothing is done. The new people do not all draw together & I doubt what agreement there is may be exactly as your Lordship & I could wish it. I only differ in this. I think it not so much a Whig parliament as a dependent one may be apprehended."²³⁶

Even with the Court inactive the Tories had immense advantages in the election. It was clear to all voters that the Queen had decided against the Whigs even if she had not thrown all her weight behind the Tories. The religious issue was the chief debating topic, for the Sacheverell trial aroused intense emotion throughout the country, and it was the Tories who benefited from the work of those ideal propagandists, the lower clergy. Many of those, who had opposed Sacheverell, were not re-elected,²³⁷ including Thomas Coke, a courtier of moderate Tory leanings. Dyer reported, gleefully, of a scuffle at Bridgnorth, merely about choosing candidates, which ended with "yo Church militant prevailing" and the Whigs being driven out of the town.²³⁸ L'Hermitage, the Dutch agent,

236 Leicester Record Office. Finch Mss. Box vi, bundle 23. Letter dated 31 Aug. 1710.

237 Mary Ransome calculated that, of 217 M.P.s, who voted against Dr. Sacheverell, only 126 were re-elected. 'Church and Dissent in the General Election of 1710', E.H.R. (1941), lvi, 79.

238 B.M. Portland (Harley) papers. Loan 29/321. Dyer's Newsletter, 31 Aug. 1710.

believed that the clergy had never turned out in such numbers to vote for the Church party.²³⁹ At the county election at Gloucester Sir John Guise was thrown out "chiefly by ye interest of the Clergy, who were exstreamly provok'd by him for having said, that ye Church might as well be govern'd by Presbyters, as B[isho]ps."²⁴⁰ The Whigs had no reply to this clerical hostility for even the Dissenters had been dissuaded by Harley from voting in a body for Whig candidates.²⁴¹ An exception to the general rule of the lower clergy supporting the Tories was the county election at Bedfordshire, where St. John lost face in attempting to challenge the Russell interest. Bishop Wake learned:

"On Thursday last ye Election was made for ye county of Bedford, w[he]n Mr. Harvey lost it only by 39 voices near 40 of our Brethren voted for my Lord [Russell] or Sir Will[iam Gostwick], or both; wch must needs be a terrible mortification to Mr. St. John, who some time ago, by way of advertisement in ye Postboy, told ye world with equal truth & modesty, yt Mr. Harvey would offer himself to ye service of his Country at ye request of the whole body of ye clergy of Bedfordshire: w[he]n, by wt I can learn, ye generality of ye Clergy knew nothing of the matter: I'm sure I, & my few friends were entirely strangers to ye request till we were told it in print. Some men have a strange knack of fibbing for ye truth."²⁴²

Though St. John suffered a personal set-back in this instance, he played a notable part in stating the Tory case on the other great

239 B.M. Add.Ms. 17677, DDD, ff. 618, 627. To the States General, 28 Oct. and 7 Nov. 1710.

240 Christ Church Library. Wake Mss. Arch. Wake Epist., vol. 23, letter 209. Maurice Wheeler to Bishop Wake, Gloster, 30 Oct. 1710.

241 The Wentworth Papers, p. 151. Peter Wentworth to Lord Raby, Twickenham, 27 Oct. 1710.

242 Christ Church Library. Wake Mss. Lincoln papers, i, f. 256. Tho. Frank to Bishop Wake, Cranfield, 6 Oct. 1710.

election issue, that of war or peace. The Whigs debated this in their election propaganda much more than the Tories. They argued that the Tories would endanger the country and the Hanoverian succession by making a hasty and inadequate peace. It is surprising, in view of the growing war-weariness, that the Tories did not make greater use of a promise to negotiate a speedy peace.²⁴³ St. John was one of the few Tories to attempt to make this a major election issue. In A Letter to the Examiner, published before the election, he pointed out the changed character of the war: "We engaged as confederates, but we have been made to proceed as principals; principals in expence of blood and treasure, whilst hardly a second place in respect and dignity is allowed to us."²⁴⁴ Even if not fully exploited, the widespread dissatisfaction with the war materially assisted the Tory cause.

The lukewarm attitude of the Court, and any failures to exploit their advantages, did not prevent the Tories gaining a decisive victory. All the evidence is unanimous on this point, though the actual numerical superiority of the Tories is a matter of dispute. James Craggs warned the duke of Marlborough: "There never was so prevalent a fury as the people of England shew against the Whigs and for the High Church I believe in Parliament they will exceed two to one. The Tory party will

²⁴³ For the press campaign in the election see, Mary Ransome, 'The Press in the General Election of 1710', Cambridge Historical Journal (1939), vi, no. 2, 209-221.

²⁴⁴ Somers Tracts, ed. Sir Walter Scott, xiii, 72.

have it in their power to reward those that called them in for they will
be able to carry everything independently of them." ²⁴⁵ William Rippin

told Sir John Pakington that Dr. Wilson "was advised from London that
this will be a right Church of England Parliament." ²⁴⁶ Peter Wentworth

was more explicit: "Above half the elections are over and the Tories have
carry'd it everywhere almost, so that they will be stronger than they was

in the first year of the Queen's reign." ²⁴⁷ The list among the Stowe ²⁴⁸
papers gave an interim result of 304 Tories, 145 Whigs, and 30 doubtful.

While this was an incomplete list, and to some extent inaccurate, it gave a
Tory majority of about two to one, which most later authorities would
²⁴⁹
support.

St. John, himself, was elected for both Berkshire and Wootton
Bassett, choosing to sit for the former. His Wootton Bassett seat was

245 B.M. Add. Mss. 9110, f. 123. Letter dated London, 13 Oct. 1710.

246 Hampton papers. Letter dated Nelson, 3 Nov. 1710.

247 The Wentworth Papers, p. 149. To Lord Raby, Twickenham, 20 Oct. 1710.
The earl of Sunderland was alone in hoping that the Tory success might
not be too great, but this was before the election results came in.
See his letters to Lord Lonsdale, Althorp, 30 Sept. 1710 in H.M.C.,
Lonsdale Mss., p. 121, and to Lord Cowper, 31 Aug. 1710, among the
Cowper Mss. in Hertfordshire Record Office.

248 B.M. Stowe Ms. 223, ff. 453-56.

249 Mary Ransome, 'The General Election of 1710', London M.A. thesis (1939),
p. 199, suggested 350 Tories, 186 Whigs, and the rest doubtful.
W. A. Speck, 'The House of Commons 1702-1714: A study in political
organisation', Oxford D.Phil. thesis (1965), calculated the result,
ignoring the Scottish members, as 329 Tories and 184 Whigs.

filled by Edmund Pleydell, a neighbour and second cousin. Robert Cecil failed to retain the other seat at Wootton Bassett, where another Tory and Wiltshire gentleman, Richard Goddard, was returned. After two years in the wilderness St. John returned to the Commons in triumph. The unpleasantness over the Wootton Bassett seat was forgotten, he was now a knight of the shire, and he was a leading minister. He could look forward to playing a great rôle in the new parliament. Robert Harley, on the other hand, found himself in a very awkward situation. He led a ministry which still countenanced many Whigs in office, while in the Commons there was a large Tory majority anxious for a clean sweep of all these Whig placemen. Some Tories, like Nottingham, opposed his moderation, while the Whigs were prepared to obstruct his efforts to secure peace or to put the new ministry on a sound financial footing. The next four years were to be dominated by his efforts to steer a course among the Whig rocks and the Tory reefs. His problems were not a little exacerbated by Henry St. John's efforts to exploit them to his own and, as St. John asserted, to the Tory party's advantage.